PCA Case No. 2023-01

IN THE MATTER OF AN ARBITRATION

-before-

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

-between-

THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

-and-

THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

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

COURT OF ARBITRATION:

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

SECRETARIAT:

The Permanent Court of Arbitration

ON BEHALF OF THE COURT OF ARBITRATION:

CERTIFIED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 19 OF ANNEXURE G

10 July 2024

Professor Sean D. Murphy

Chairman

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

Permanent Court of Arbitration
Peace Palace
The Hague
The Netherlands

Day 3

Wednesday, 10 July 2024

Hearing of the First Phase on the Merits

Before:

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

BETWEEN:

THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN
-andTHE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

Transcript produced by Trevor McGowan Georgina Vaughn and Lisa Gulland

APPEARANCES

FOR THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

MR 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

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

MR ABDULLAH TARIQ, Fietta LLP, London

DR GREGORY L MORRIS, Technical Advisor

MS MEGAN RIPPIN, Fietta LLP, London

MR PETER J RAE, Technical Advisor

Day 3 Overview1
By Sir Daniel Bethlehem1
Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation:12
An Engineering Perspective (continued)
By Dr Morris12
Court questions15
Court questions32
Questions from THE COURT51
Incorporating a Run-of-River HEP62
in an Integrated Power System
By Mr Rae62
Questions from THE COURT105
Submissions on Baglihar and Kishenganga115
Systemic Interpretation Issues and Response to
Question (a)
By Mr Fietta115
Court questions131
Court questions143
Court questions149
Court questions158
Court questions163
Questions from THE COURT179
Submissions on the Western Rivers Run-of-River182
Hydro Bargain
By Professor Webb182

Court questions	.191
Court questions	.206
Questions from THE COURT	.219

,			
09:10 1	Wednesday, 10 July 2024	09:36 1	And she will also address the Court's question 35(b) on
2	(9.33 am)	2	the extent to which non-Treaty-based best practices can
3	THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, everyone. Good to see you	3	be or must be incorporated into the Treaty. A number of
4	again.	4	these issues have already been addressed, but these will
5	I see that Sir Daniel is at the podium, perhaps to	5	take them to another level of detail.
6	tell us how things will unfold over the course of the	6	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, each of the
7	day. So, Sir Daniel, you have the floor.	7	submissions that you are hearing and have heard and will
8	SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. I hope that	8	hear from us has the purpose of putting an additional
9	you managed to survive the deluge last night. It's only	9	layer of bricks into our interpretative structure, and
10	when we saw the orange rain warning that we appreciated	10	to ensure that particular evidential underpinnings are
11	the 5.30 stop yesterday evening!	11	properly cemented into that structure. It may not
12	(9.34 am)	12	always be apparent with all of the presentations exactly
13	Day 3 Overview	13	what those bricks are, but we will attempt to draw all
14	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before	14	of the threads together; that's certainly one of the
15	Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of	15	things that I'll attempt to do tomorrow morning.
16	yesterday, let me just give you the very briefest of	16	The purpose of Dr Morris's presentation, and which
17	roadmaps of what you'll be hearing from us today. It	17	he is in the midst of, is both to provide you with
18	will be building the next layer of the pyramid, getting	18	an opportunity to revisit some of the design and
19	narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation can	19	operation issues that you heard about during the
20	you hear with the?	20	Neelum-Jhelum site visit and to make a number of points
21	THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will need to close the windows, at	21	about the constraints that apply to the design and
22	least temporarily, until we have less noise coming in	22	operation of all run-of-river HEPs in the Himalaya.
23	from the outside. So if you'll just bear with us for	23	Dr Morris will continue with this shortly.
24	a moment, Sir Daniel, we'll do that. (Pause)	24	I know, for reasons of time constraint, there was
25	Okay, I think we are ready to proceed.	25	perhaps a self-denying ordinance on your part not to ask
	Page 1		Page 3
00.25 1	SID DANIEL: It is unlifting for the spirits to think that	00.38 1	him quartions parhans there were no quartions but
09:35 1	SIR DANIEL: It is uplifting for the spirits to think that	09:38 1	him questions perhaps there were no questions but
2	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while	2	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the
2 3	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here.	2 3	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended
2 3 4	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to	2 3 4	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or
2 3 4 5	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give	2 3 4 5	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage
2 3 4 5 6	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from	2 3 4 5 6	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the	2 3 4 5 6 7	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and Kishenganga systemic interpretation issues. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow. Following Dr Morris, Mr Rae will be coming to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and Kishenganga systemic interpretation issues. And Mr Fietta will also be responding to the Court's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow. Following Dr Morris, Mr Rae will be coming to the podium. And as I've already said, Mr Rae brings
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and Kishenganga systemic interpretation issues. And Mr Fietta will also be responding to the Court's question 35(a) on the effect of past decisions of Courts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow. Following Dr Morris, Mr Rae will be coming to the podium. And as I've already said, Mr Rae brings a rather unique experience and insight to the table.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and Kishenganga systemic interpretation issues. And Mr Fietta will also be responding to the Court's question 35(a) on the effect of past decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts on future Article IX	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow. Following Dr Morris, Mr Rae will be coming to the podium. And as I've already said, Mr Rae brings a rather unique experience and insight to the table. Unusually, as I understand our engineering colleagues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and Kishenganga systemic interpretation issues. And Mr Fietta will also be responding to the Court's question 35(a) on the effect of past decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts on future Article IX settlement processes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow. Following Dr Morris, Mr Rae will be coming to the podium. And as I've already said, Mr Rae brings a rather unique experience and insight to the table. Unusually, as I understand our engineering colleagues will know more but unusually, as I understand, Mr Rae
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and Kishenganga systemic interpretation issues. And Mr Fietta will also be responding to the Court's question 35(a) on the effect of past decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts on future Article IX settlement processes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow. Following Dr Morris, Mr Rae will be coming to the podium. And as I've already said, Mr Rae brings a rather unique experience and insight to the table. Unusually, as I understand our engineering colleagues will know more but unusually, as I understand, Mr Rae has an experience that goes from the design of HEPs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and Kishenganga systemic interpretation issues. And Mr Fietta will also be responding to the Court's question 35(a) on the effect of past decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts on future Article IX settlement processes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will address you on the Western Rivers run-of-river	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow. Following Dr Morris, Mr Rae will be coming to the podium. And as I've already said, Mr Rae brings a rather unique experience and insight to the table. Unusually, as I understand our engineering colleagues will know more but unusually, as I understand, Mr Rae has an experience that goes from the design of HEPs through to their operation, rather than simply focusing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and Kishenganga systemic interpretation issues. And Mr Fietta will also be responding to the Court's question 35(a) on the effect of past decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts on future Article IX settlement processes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will address you on the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain and the controlling effect of Article III.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow. Following Dr Morris, Mr Rae will be coming to the podium. And as I've already said, Mr Rae brings a rather unique experience and insight to the table. Unusually, as I understand our engineering colleagues will know more but unusually, as I understand, Mr Rae has an experience that goes from the design of HEPs through to their operation, rather than simply focusing on particular aspects of HEPs. And he is also a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there is someone who is cutting the lawn outside while we are working in here. As I was saying, just before Dr Morris stands up to continue his submissions of yesterday, I'd like to give you just a brief roadmap of what you'll be hearing from us today. It will be building on the next layer of the pyramid, getting ever narrower in focus, and preparing the foundation a little bit more for the detailed submissions that you will hear from us tomorrow about the interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria. Following Dr Morris, you will have three submissions today. Dr Morris will be followed by Mr Rae, who will be addressing you on incorporating run-of-river HEPs into an integrated power system. After Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues, with Mr Fietta then addressing you on Baglihar and Kishenganga systemic interpretation issues. And Mr Fietta will also be responding to the Court's question 35(a) on the effect of past decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts on future Article IX settlement processes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will address you on the Western Rivers run-of-river	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	please do feel free to put questions to him. One of the reasons why we have presented him here in an open-ended format, rather than through a witness statement or anything like that, was precisely to allow you to engage with him, including on the Neelum-Jhelum issues. I should note that Dr Morris's presentations of yesterday afternoon and today are also intended to provide the jumping-off platform for his second presentation tomorrow, which will be on approaching the paragraph 8 design criteria from the perspective of an engineer. So this is the foundation; tomorrow he will actually be looking at the texts. And as I say, we will be endeavouring to pull the threads together of these presentations during the course of tomorrow. Following Dr Morris, Mr Rae will be coming to the podium. And as I've already said, Mr Rae brings a rather unique experience and insight to the table. Unusually, as I understand our engineering colleagues will know more but unusually, as I understand, Mr Rae has an experience that goes from the design of HEPs through to their operation, rather than simply focusing on particular aspects of HEPs. And he is also a veteran

5 (Pages 1 to 4)

09:39	1	His presentation on incorporating run-of-river HEPs	09:42 1	precisely is because in the period leading up to
	2	into an integrated power system was in fact suggested to	2	February 2016 you will recall that's when the letter
	3	us internally, as we were reflecting on this hearing, by	3	was sent by the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters
	4	a number of the exchanges that you, the members of the	4	to his Indian counterpart saying, "We're moving beyond
	5	Court, had with the site experts at the Neelum-Jhelum	5	all of the discussion about the Neutral Expert; we
	6	plant on how run-of-river hydropower plants would or	6	believe that this has to be taken to a Court of
	7	might fit into an integrated power grid that was also	7	Arbitration, because we believe these questions need to
	8	fed by solar, by wind, by nuclear. But I think the	8	be settled with systemic effect" and the reason why
	9	focus of your questions, as I recall them from the site	9	we are here is precisely because of the concerns about
	10	visit, was in particular with regard to renewable energy	10	Baglihar; that these issues could not be addressed on
	11	resources and environmental and climate change	11	a plant-by-plant basis for evermore; and that if the
	12	considerations. So the session, again, is intended to	12	Indus Waters Treaty was to return to functionality, that
	13	provide you with an opportunity to address these issues	13	it would be necessary to secure a binding interpretation
	14	further with an expert engineer who is working in the	14	of systemic effect on the meaning of the design criteria
	15	field.	15	in paragraph 8 of Annexure D.
	16	Following Mr Rae, we will return to the legal issues	16	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, perhaps I might
	17	with Mr Fietta. And Mr Fietta's submissions on the	17	pause there to step away from my scripted remarks to
	18	weight that should be accorded to the conclusions of the	18	make an observation, because it's one that has of course
	19	Kishenganga Court and the weight or otherwise we say	19	been weighing upon us; and we expect, in particular from
	20	"or otherwise" that should not be given to the	20	some of the questions that you've been posing over the
	21	Neutral Expert's determination in the Baglihar	21	course of the last couple of days, that it is quite
	22	proceedings are, of course, central to Pakistan's case	22	properly weighing heavily on your shoulders as well.
	23	and we appreciate that they will be central to your	23	What this first phase of the merits is addressing
	24	deliberations. Because one of the issues that we have	24	are systemic issues. And what is going to be called
	25	put before you is: what weight is to be given to	25	upon from you is a systemic interpretation that is going
		Page 5		Page 7
09:41	1	Raymond Lafitte's determination in 2007 in Baglihar?	09:43 1	
	1	Raymond Lamic 8 determination in 2007 in Daginar:	07.73	to address all of these issues, for evermore, for all of
		•	2	to address all of these issues, for evermore, for all of these treaties.
	2	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the	2	these treaties.
	2 3	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these		these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily
	2 3 4	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central	2 3 4	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into
	2 3	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations.	2 3	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious
	2 3 4 5 6	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some	2 3 4 5	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into
	2 3 4 5 6 7	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably	2 3 4 5 6	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you
	2 3 4 5 6	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition	2 3 4 5 6 7	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP. Mr Fietta will address these issues in the round.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain that is constructed, as we have characterised it we
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP. Mr Fietta will address these issues in the round. But in so doing, he will also respond to your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain that is constructed, as we have characterised it we believe correctly around the rule and the exception
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP. Mr Fietta will address these issues in the round. But in so doing, he will also respond to your question 35(a), which asked directly about the weight	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain that is constructed, as we have characterised it we believe correctly around the rule and the exception for hydroelectric power in Article III and Annexure D.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP. Mr Fietta will address these issues in the round. But in so doing, he will also respond to your question 35(a), which asked directly about the weight and effect of previous decisions of Courts of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain that is constructed, as we have characterised it we believe correctly around the rule and the exception for hydroelectric power in Article III and Annexure D. Mr Chairman, I come on to make an observation which
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP. Mr Fietta will address these issues in the round. But in so doing, he will also respond to your question 35(a), which asked directly about the weight and effect of previous decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain that is constructed, as we have characterised it we believe correctly around the rule and the exception for hydroelectric power in Article III and Annexure D. Mr Chairman, I come on to make an observation which I think goes to your exchange with Professor Webb around
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP. Mr Fietta will address these issues in the round. But in so doing, he will also respond to your question 35(a), which asked directly about the weight and effect of previous decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts. Mr Fietta's submissions will, of course, also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain that is constructed, as we have characterised it we believe correctly around the rule and the exception for hydroelectric power in Article III and Annexure D. Mr Chairman, I come on to make an observation which I think goes to your exchange with Professor Webb around the Waldock drafts. She will come back to those in due
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP. Mr Fietta will address these issues in the round. But in so doing, he will also respond to your question 35(a), which asked directly about the weight and effect of previous decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts. Mr Fietta's submissions will, of course, also necessarily address the weight and effect that will in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain that is constructed, as we have characterised it we believe correctly around the rule and the exception for hydroelectric power in Article III and Annexure D. Mr Chairman, I come on to make an observation which I think goes to your exchange with Professor Webb around the Waldock drafts. She will come back to those in due course, but let me just make the observation in advance
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP. Mr Fietta will address these issues in the round. But in so doing, he will also respond to your question 35(a), which asked directly about the weight and effect of previous decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts. Mr Fietta's submissions will, of course, also necessarily address the weight and effect that will in due course attach to your award in this first phase of the merits. And indeed, the reason why we are here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain that is constructed, as we have characterised it we believe correctly around the rule and the exception for hydroelectric power in Article III and Annexure D. Mr Chairman, I come on to make an observation which I think goes to your exchange with Professor Webb around the Waldock drafts. She will come back to those in due course, but let me just make the observation in advance of her. The rule of unrestricted use, as you know, is that
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We say the methodology was completely flawed and the conclusions were inconsistent with the Treaty. So these issues are central to our case, and they will be central to your deliberations. The Kishenganga Court, we say, laid down some dispositive findings of systemic interpretation, notably with regard to but not confined to the prohibition on drawdown flushing or empty flushing, under the Treaty, which the Kishenganga Court actually dealt with as a systemic question, not simply as a question that was confined to the KHEP. And in so doing, the Kishenganga Court expressly rejected the Neutral Expert's analysis in Baglihar and the systemic application of his determination beyond the Baglihar HEP. Mr Fietta will address these issues in the round. But in so doing, he will also respond to your question 35(a), which asked directly about the weight and effect of previous decisions of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts. Mr Fietta's submissions will, of course, also necessarily address the weight and effect that will in due course attach to your award in this first phase of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	these treaties. We very much appreciate that this will weigh heavily upon you. And one of the reasons why we're going into such small and sometimes, it may appear, such tedious detail is that we would like you to have the evidential underpinnings for every single issue that you feel you need to join up in order to reach your systemic interpretation. But I'll come back to that perhaps in my closing on Friday. Following Mr Fietta, Professor Webb will return to the interpretative issues. And she will focus on peeling back the skin in greater detail on what we say is the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain; that is the third of the bargains embodied in the Treaty. You will recall that the hydro bargain is the bargain that is constructed, as we have characterised it we believe correctly around the rule and the exception for hydroelectric power in Article III and Annexure D. Mr Chairman, I come on to make an observation which I think goes to your exchange with Professor Webb around the Waldock drafts. She will come back to those in due course, but let me just make the observation in advance of her.

09:45	of Pakistan's right to unrestricted use of the waters of	09:48 1 been very much like a pyramid, starting with the
2	_	2 broadest of brushes and building up, and from tomorrow
3	· · · ·	3 you'll begin to have sight of the summit. The summit is
2		4 where the air is thin, where the temperatures are cold,
5		5 where the winds blow, but also where the end is in
6		6 sight.
7	-	7 So thank you very much. With that, I'd invite you
8	•	8 to ask Dr Morris back to the stand.
Ģ		9 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you, Sir Daniel, for those
10		10 very helpful introductory comments. We appreciate as
1		11 well your revisiting some of the points that were raised
12		in prior questions to give us a little bit more insight
13	-	into Pakistan's position, and appreciate that it will be
14		14 followed up as well in due course by others in their
1:		15 presentations.
10		So at this point I do invite Dr Morris to return to
1′	•	the podium for the completion of his presentation from
18		18 yesterday.
19		19 SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, perhaps while Dr Morris is just
20		20 setting up all of his electronics, I might just add
2		21 you may be aware of this because this is a discussion
22		that we've had with the Secretariat and with the
23		23 technicians Dr Morris does not only have his
24	_	24 presentation on his laptop but he is also iPad-enabled
2:		and has the facility to speak through drawings, not only
	Page 9	Page 11
09:47 1	acknowledges that the right is subject to exceptions.	09:50 1 words.
09:47 1		09:50 1 words. 2 The reason why I mention this is because we have had
09:47 1	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are	2 The reason why I mention this is because we have had
2	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians
2	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly
2 3 4	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of
3	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly
2 3 4 5	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer
2 3 4 5	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms.	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his
2 3 4 5 6	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words.
2 3 2 5 6 7 8	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception,	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. 11 (9.50 am)
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. 11 (9.50 am) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation:
2 3 2 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 12	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. 10 Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) DR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) DR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to
2 3 2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you have an exception. Perhaps, Professor Murphy, this goes	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) DR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to preserve reservoir capacity. (Pause)
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 16	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you have an exception. Perhaps, Professor Murphy, this goes to your question yesterday. But as I say,	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) DR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to preserve reservoir capacity. (Pause) (Slide 31) This diagram outlines four basic ways to
12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you have an exception. Perhaps, Professor Murphy, this goes to your question yesterday. But as I say, Professor Webb will come back and unpack that all.	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) PR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to preserve reservoir capacity. (Pause) (Slide 31) This diagram outlines four basic ways to manage sediment. And sediment management is something
2 3 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you have an exception. Perhaps, Professor Murphy, this goes to your question yesterday. But as I say, Professor Webb will come back and unpack that all. Then finally, Mr Chairman, members of the court,	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) PR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to preserve reservoir capacity. (Pause) (Slide 31) This diagram outlines four basic ways to manage sediment. And sediment management is something that historically, in storage reservoirs, you would
2 3 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you have an exception. Perhaps, Professor Murphy, this goes to your question yesterday. But as I say, Professor Webb will come back and unpack that all. Then finally, Mr Chairman, members of the court, starting tomorrow, we will endeavour to draw the threads	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) PR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to preserve reservoir capacity. (Pause) (Slide 31) This diagram outlines four basic ways to manage sediment. And sediment management is something that historically, in storage reservoirs, you would design a reservoir to have 50 to 100 years of sediment
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you have an exception. Perhaps, Professor Murphy, this goes to your question yesterday. But as I say, Professor Webb will come back and unpack that all. Then finally, Mr Chairman, members of the court, starting tomorrow, we will endeavour to draw the threads together of all of these various presentations and apply	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) DR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to preserve reservoir capacity. (Pause) (Slide 31) This diagram outlines four basic ways to manage sediment. And sediment management is something that historically, in storage reservoirs, you would design a reservoir to have 50 to 100 years of sediment storage. That was the way to manage it, and in the
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you have an exception. Perhaps, Professor Murphy, this goes to your question yesterday. But as I say, Professor Webb will come back and unpack that all. Then finally, Mr Chairman, members of the court, starting tomorrow, we will endeavour to draw the threads together of all of these various presentations and apply them to the interpretative task of construing the	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) PR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to preserve reservoir capacity. (Pause) (Slide 31) This diagram outlines four basic ways to manage sediment. And sediment management is something that historically, in storage reservoirs, you would design a reservoir to have 50 to 100 years of sediment storage. That was the way to manage it, and in the future then someone else will deal with the problem.
22 33 24 55 66 77 88 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22 22	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you have an exception. Perhaps, Professor Murphy, this goes to your question yesterday. But as I say, Professor Webb will come back and unpack that all. Then finally, Mr Chairman, members of the court, starting tomorrow, we will endeavour to draw the threads together of all of these various presentations and apply them to the interpretative task of construing the paragraph 8 design criteria. And I do emphasise and	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. (9.50 am) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) DR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to preserve reservoir capacity. (Pause) (Slide 31) This diagram outlines four basic ways to manage sediment. And sediment management is something that historically, in storage reservoirs, you would design a reservoir to have 50 to 100 years of sediment storage. That was the way to manage it, and in the future then someone else will deal with the problem. But run-of-river plants are very interesting because
22 33 24 55 66 78 89 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 22 22 22 22 22	But we also go on to say that the exceptions are tightly constrained and must be construed for what they are: exceptions to a right, not as a self-standing provision of entitlement that avails India without regard to Pakistan's right. And perhaps this comes to the Fitzmaurice/Waldock debate, if I can put it in those terms. The exception for hydroelectric power is a carve-out from Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, in which the attribution of the right also expresses the exception, with a renvoi to Annexure D. You find the headline right in the same provision you find the exception, and then you have articulation of the detail of the exception in Annexure D. It's not that you have a right and somewhere else in the Treaty, semi-detached, you have an exception. Perhaps, Professor Murphy, this goes to your question yesterday. But as I say, Professor Webb will come back and unpack that all. Then finally, Mr Chairman, members of the court, starting tomorrow, we will endeavour to draw the threads together of all of these various presentations and apply them to the interpretative task of construing the paragraph 8 design criteria. And I do emphasise and	The reason why I mention this is because we have had discussion with the Secretariat and with the technicians just to make sure that the drawings are also properly captured in the record, so that they are not sort of somehow lost. The drawings will be the engineer speaking through his drawings, rather than through his words. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. Dr Morris. Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective (continued) DR MORRIS: (Slide 30) Good morning. (Pause) Today in the morning I'll start talking about management options to preserve reservoir capacity. (Pause) (Slide 31) This diagram outlines four basic ways to manage sediment. And sediment management is something that historically, in storage reservoirs, you would design a reservoir to have 50 to 100 years of sediment storage. That was the way to manage it, and in the future then someone else will deal with the problem. But run-of-river plants are very interesting because they have historically not had large storage capacities.

7 (Pages 9 to 12)

09:51	1	facing today were addressed early on and I mean early	09:54 1	construction but it's not a cure-all, by any means.
	2	on in the prior century and addressed successfully by	2	Let me make one more comment. As a dam owner, if
	3	the run-of-river plants. So a lot of the techniques	3	you want to change your watershed, you have to deal with
	4	that are being applied to storage plants today actually	4	thousands of people and thousands of property owners.
	5	originated with the run-of-river plants.	5	So when I deal with dams, I say: yes, you can look at
	6	So it's kind of interesting to see that the	6	watershed, you should deal with it; but really you need
	7	run-of-river plants were actually the precursors of	7	to focus on how you're going to operate what you can
	8	successfully implementing sediment management strategies	8	control.
	9	which are now being moved into the realm of storage	9	So we have two yes.
	10	plants. I just want to make that clear. And I learned	10	THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, if you don't mind, Dr Blackmore
	11	quite a bit about sediment management that would be	11	has a question for you.
	12	viable in a storage plant based on lessons learnt from	12	DR BLACKMORE: I liked the introduction and the contrast.
	13	run-of-river plants.	13	I was just interested though on the Himalayas. Because
	14	Now, basically, this is a diagram that I worked up	14	we're going to move on to reservoirs now, but before we
	15	some years ago, but it shows four basic strategies: you	15	do that, more generally I'd like you to give me your
	16	can reduce sediment yield, you can route sediments, you	16	understanding of sediment generation through seismic
	17	can remove deposited sediment or you can adapt to	17	activity in the Himalayas, because we know we can't
	18	sediment. In other words, the adaptive strategies are	18	manage that, but whether that's a significant issue,
	19	things that you do when you're not touching the	19	from your perspective.
	20	sediment, but you're, like, for instance, putting	20	DR MORRIS: It's a significant issue because it helps to
	21	coatings on a turbine or something like that.	21	generate landslides.
	22	(Slide 32) Basically, reducing sediment yield:	22	There was one of the reservoirs, Kulekhani, in
	23	erosion control. Routing sediments is passing the	23	Nepal, there was an earthquake and there was also
	24	sediments through or around your storage. Removal:	24	a large monsoon which tended to coincide in time, and
	25	flushing and dredging. And your adaptations: turbine	25	dramatic loss in sediment. The place where I've seen
		Page 13		Page 15
		1 450 13		1 ugo 13
09:53	1	coatings, et cetera.	09:56 1	this the most severe is in Taiwan, which is where I was
	2	(Slide 33) Watershed management in the High Himalaya	•	
	_	(Since 33) watershed management in the ringh rinnaraya	2	able to really visualise it.
	3	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited,	3	able to really visualise it. Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce
				-
	3	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited,	3	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce
	3 4	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the	3 4	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are
	3 4 5	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative	3 4 5	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door.
	3 4 5 6	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates,	3 4 5 6	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see	3 4 5 6 7	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or	3 4 5 6 7 8	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms. Pakistan, in the Mangla Reservoir watershed, has	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to dealing with the small.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms. Pakistan, in the Mangla Reservoir watershed, has also been successful in reducing sediment loads by	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to dealing with the small. So we now have three major dams, and a whole lot of
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms. Pakistan, in the Mangla Reservoir watershed, has also been successful in reducing sediment loads by watershed works. But High Himalaya, it's not going to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to dealing with the small. So we now have three major dams, and a whole lot of smaller dams around, that have effectively cut off the
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms. Pakistan, in the Mangla Reservoir watershed, has also been successful in reducing sediment loads by watershed works. But High Himalaya, it's not going to work up there. So it can work in the proper	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to dealing with the small. So we now have three major dams, and a whole lot of smaller dams around, that have effectively cut off the flow of sediment, changed the morphology of the river.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms. Pakistan, in the Mangla Reservoir watershed, has also been successful in reducing sediment loads by watershed works. But High Himalaya, it's not going to work up there. So it can work in the proper environment but the potential for this to work in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to dealing with the small. So we now have three major dams, and a whole lot of smaller dams around, that have effectively cut off the flow of sediment, changed the morphology of the river. And I'm just wondering, given that you have given this
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms. Pakistan, in the Mangla Reservoir watershed, has also been successful in reducing sediment loads by watershed works. But High Himalaya, it's not going to work up there. So it can work in the proper environment but the potential for this to work in the Himalaya is limited because you have landslides, which	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to dealing with the small. So we now have three major dams, and a whole lot of smaller dams around, that have effectively cut off the flow of sediment, changed the morphology of the river. And I'm just wondering, given that you have given this a great deal of thought, what do you see as the future
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms. Pakistan, in the Mangla Reservoir watershed, has also been successful in reducing sediment loads by watershed works. But High Himalaya, it's not going to work up there. So it can work in the proper environment but the potential for this to work in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to dealing with the small. So we now have three major dams, and a whole lot of smaller dams around, that have effectively cut off the flow of sediment, changed the morphology of the river. And I'm just wondering, given that you have given this
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms. Pakistan, in the Mangla Reservoir watershed, has also been successful in reducing sediment loads by watershed works. But High Himalaya, it's not going to work up there. So it can work in the proper environment but the potential for this to work in the Himalaya is limited because you have landslides, which	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to dealing with the small. So we now have three major dams, and a whole lot of smaller dams around, that have effectively cut off the flow of sediment, changed the morphology of the river. And I'm just wondering, given that you have given this a great deal of thought, what do you see as the future
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	is quite limited, the potential is quite limited, because successful watershed management focuses on the restoration of vegetation. We see that when you have excessive grazing, poor agricultural practices, that you destroy the soil cover, you destroy the vegetative cover, and this greatly accelerates the erosion rates, by a factor of, say, 100. It's not unusual to see a hundredfold increase in erosion rates on properties or pieces of land that have been degraded. So watershed management, where you have enough water and the climate is amenable to vegetation, you can achieve very considerable improvements in reducing the sediment load. And we have in the United States a number of areas of the country where we see quite a dramatic decrease because of all the conservation programmes that have been worked on in farms. Pakistan, in the Mangla Reservoir watershed, has also been successful in reducing sediment loads by watershed works. But High Himalaya, it's not going to work up there. So it can work in the proper environment but the potential for this to work in the Himalaya is limited because you have landslides, which of course are accelerated by things such as road	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Earthquakes produce landslides, and they produce scars on the landscape, and that is where you are generating your sediment. A landscape scar can produce easily 100 times more sediment per square metre of land surface compared to vegetative land which is next door. So seismic activity is important, but it's just part of the picture. But it's definitely an important part. DR BLACKMORE: So the Indus Valley was created by erosion. DR MORRIS: Mm. DR BLACKMORE: And we've now effectively cut off we've got sediment traps DR MORRIS: Yes. DR BLACKMORE: called dams that have cut off the vast majority of sediment and silt getting to those landscapes. So I just want to understand, from your perspective, the bigger picture, before we go back to dealing with the small. So we now have three major dams, and a whole lot of smaller dams around, that have effectively cut off the flow of sediment, changed the morphology of the river. And I'm just wondering, given that you have given this a great deal of thought, what do you see as the future of the area downstream of these dams, and what happens

09:58 1	if you reintroduce sediment?	10:01 1	and into the ocean, which is ideal. But in my visits
2	DR MORRIS: That is a wonderful question, and that is the	2	and discussions with the operators at Kotri Barrage
3	next challenge.	3	which is the most downstream barrage on the Indus, just
4	When you talk about geology, you talk about	4	before it goes into the Arabian Sea they have assured
5	long-term periods. When you talk about dams, you're	5	me that the recent not "recent", but this is just
6	talking about a blip in geology. This is one of the	6	pre-Covid recent that their modifications and
7	things that I have been working with Pakistan to have	7	rehabilitation allows them to divert all the remaining
8	them understand, as well as other countries. But	8	water to irrigation.
9	particularly Pakistan, because I think Pakistan has	9	So we have a river with a large sediment load, very
10	probably the most severe water resource problem of any	10	little water going to the sea, and we have to deal with
11	country in the word, in terms of the challenge that it	11	what we're going to do. We do not yet have the answer,
12	faces. And one of the challenges the big	12	but we will find the answer. And if we don't find the
13	challenge is exactly what you put your finger on: the	13	answer, it's going to happen anyway.
14	sediment.	14	The dams are only temporary. They can only store
15	For instance, along the Indus, we have Tarbela,	15	a very small amount of sediment compared to what geology
16	which has now lost over 40% of its capacity; we have	16	is giving us.
17	Dasu, which is being built upstream; and we also have	17	DR BLACKMORE: I'm only following this line of enquiry
18	Diamer-Bhasha upstream. But even if you let	18	because when you've got a hydraulic civilisation like
19	Diamer-Bhasha and Dasu fill to their design level, you	19	Pakistan, or in Egypt on the Nile, with Aswan, and many
20	only buy 40 years of storage at Tarbela.	20	others we could spend hours talking about, you've bought
21	You cannot stop erosion in the Himalaya: it's going	21	a period of time when you've got stability; and then
22	to go downstream, and it's going to go downstream either	22	you've got a period of time when you have instability,
23	over the dam or through the dam or around the dam. It's	23	because you'll change the morphology of the river,
24	going to get downstream.	24	depending on how you elect to transport.
25	And one of the issues at Tarbela is that you do not	25	How long you said "finite", so I wondered whether
	Page 17		Page 19
	Tage 17		1 age 19
09:59 1	have the option of walking away from it. Tarbela has	10:02 1	you had a number for how long before remedial action, of
09:59 1	have the option of walking away from it. Tarbela has got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that,	10:02 1	you had a number for how long before remedial action, of the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or
2	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will	2	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or
2 3	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will	2 3	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how
2 3 4	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and	2 3 4	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in
2 3 4 5	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of	2 3 4 5	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view?
2 3 4 5 6	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in	2 3 4 5 6	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working.
2 3 4 5 6 7	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail:	2 3 4 5 6 7	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we have about 200 million tonnes of sediment a year. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have been expanded so that we're excluding sediment going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we have about 200 million tonnes of sediment a year. We have 100,000 square kilometres of irrigated area. That	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have been expanded so that we're excluding sediment going through the turbines for a period of time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we have about 200 million tonnes of sediment a year. We have 100,000 square kilometres of irrigated area. That is equivalent when we correct for bulk density	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have been expanded so that we're excluding sediment going through the turbines for a period of time. DR MORRIS: They're being lifted, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we have about 200 million tonnes of sediment a year. We have 100,000 square kilometres of irrigated area. That is equivalent when we correct for bulk density et cetera, it's about 1.5 millimetres of deposition on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have been expanded so that we're excluding sediment going through the turbines for a period of time. DR MORRIS: They're being lifted, yes. DR BLACKMORE: So I'm interested in what happens if we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we have about 200 million tonnes of sediment a year. We have 100,000 square kilometres of irrigated area. That is equivalent when we correct for bulk density et cetera, it's about 1.5 millimetres of deposition on the floodplain on the irrigated floodplain in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have been expanded so that we're excluding sediment going through the turbines for a period of time. DR MORRIS: They're being lifted, yes. DR BLACKMORE: So I'm interested in what happens if we have a seismic event now, given that we've got I first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we have about 200 million tonnes of sediment a year. We have 100,000 square kilometres of irrigated area. That is equivalent when we correct for bulk density et cetera, it's about 1.5 millimetres of deposition on the floodplain on the irrigated floodplain in a year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have been expanded so that we're excluding sediment going through the turbines for a period of time. DR MORRIS: They're being lifted, yes. DR BLACKMORE: So I'm interested in what happens if we have a seismic event now, given that we've got I first took evidence on this in 1998, in Sri Lanka. And I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we have about 200 million tonnes of sediment a year. We have 100,000 square kilometres of irrigated area. That is equivalent when we correct for bulk density et cetera, it's about 1.5 millimetres of deposition on the floodplain on the irrigated floodplain in a year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have been expanded so that we're excluding sediment going through the turbines for a period of time. DR MORRIS: They're being lifted, yes. DR BLACKMORE: So I'm interested in what happens if we have a seismic event now, given that we've got I first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we have about 200 million tonnes of sediment a year. We have 100,000 square kilometres of irrigated area. That is equivalent when we correct for bulk density et cetera, it's about 1.5 millimetres of deposition on the floodplain on the irrigated floodplain in a year. The other option, of course, is to run it downstream	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have been expanded so that we're excluding sediment going through the turbines for a period of time. DR MORRIS: They're being lifted, yes. DR BLACKMORE: So I'm interested in what happens if we have a seismic event now, given that we've got I first took evidence on this in 1998, in Sri Lanka. And I'm just interested in the evolution of time: where it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	got about 150 million tonnes of sediment. Of that, about 70 is sand. Sand going over the flip bucket will reach a velocity of about there's two spillways, and the velocity will be in the range of 40 metres a second. And you put 40 metres a second, 70 million tonnes of sand against a flip bucket, and your spillway is gone in one monsoon. You lose your spillway, the dam can fail: catastrophic downstream consequences. You cannot run away from it, you have to deal with it. So the whole objective that we're focusing on, after getting through this hearing, is working on the Indus to try and create a system where we can run sediment from the upstream, through the two reservoirs, through Tarbela and into the downstream. What are we going to do with the sediment? That's the big question everybody wants to know. And it's really interesting because, in very round numbers, we have about 200 million tonnes of sediment a year. We have 100,000 square kilometres of irrigated area. That is equivalent when we correct for bulk density et cetera, it's about 1.5 millimetres of deposition on the floodplain on the irrigated floodplain in a year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the nature of passing sediment in a controlled way, or managed way, or whichever word we want to use how long before we reach that for something like Tarbela, in your view? DR MORRIS: Ideally, it would have been already working. Realistically, it will take at least ten years to get something put together and operating. But there's not a lot of time available. Like I said, Tarbela has lost about Tarbela started impounding in 1975. Here we are in 2024 and it's already lost a little more than 40% of its capacity. So it's and the two upstream reservoirs, if you're going to use them for power, you have to manage them appropriately. DR BLACKMORE: So we've now accumulated all this sediment, and it's got a slope to it from the delta through to the outlet works. And I understand the outlet works have been expanded so that we're excluding sediment going through the turbines for a period of time. DR MORRIS: They're being lifted, yes. DR BLACKMORE: So I'm interested in what happens if we have a seismic event now, given that we've got I first took evidence on this in 1998, in Sri Lanka. And I'm

10:04		known as a problem, there was no solution at the time.	10:07 1	generating money.
	2	And I'm just wondering whether there's still the	2	So when we worked out the numbers on dredging,
	3	possibility of a catastrophic event, caused by	3	you can dredge Tarbela and pay for it by doubling the
	4	an earthquake blocking the sediment over the outlet. So	4	cost of power. Your power from Tarbela will go from
	5	I'm wondering what thinking has been going on in that	5	1 cent to 2 cents, which would still make it the
	6	space.	6	cheapest source of power that there is.
		DR MORRIS: Yes. That has been a real concern at Tarbela.	7	The other interesting thing is that they did look at
	8	And there was an extensive study done in 2013 which	8	flushing at Tarbela. And what happens is that if you
	9	is, what, 12 years ago, 11 or 12 years ago and they	9	flush Tarbela, you have to turn the turbines off for
	10	reanalysed that issue. Their conclusion was that the	10	a minimum of 30 days, maybe closer to 45. 30 days,
	11	slope on the delta is about 2%.	11	power off at Tarbela. Buying replacement power from
	12	And the delta actually has two slopes: you have the	12	a fossil fuel plant will cost you about \$500 million for
	13	face of the delta, and it flattens out; and then in	13	one month. And for \$500 million, we can do a lot of
	14	front of the intakes, you have a scour cone that goes	14	dredging. So
	15	down to the intakes, where the slope in some areas is as	15	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr Morris. It's been a very
	16	high as 3%.	16	interesting discussion, but I have to confess and
	17	But the conclusion was that for slopes less than 2%,	17	this may be the lawyer in me I'm not entirely sure
	18	the earthquake shaking would not generate a slide which	18	I understand the relevance of Pakistan's management of
	19	would be self-propagating. I should say: an underwater	19	sediment downstream for the purposes of this case.
	20 21	landslide. That it would move a little bit, but it wouldn't destabilise the entire delta. You wouldn't	20 21	It strikes me that there's value in understanding
	22	have this massive blocking. With the raising of the	21 22	how one can control sediment in upstream dams other than using, say, drawdown flushing. That seems of relevance.
	23	intakes, that problem, that danger, is essentially	23	But another possible relevance is, to the extent that
	24	eliminated for the time being. And so that's why it's	24	Pakistan wishes to avoid sediment flows, there might be
	25	important now to stabilise this and work in that	25	some value in having a lot of upstream dams that are
	23	important now to statistise this and work in that	23	
		Page 21		Page 23
10.06	1	diagratica	10.00 1	taking as diment out of the viven
10:06		direction.	10:09 1	taking sediment out of the river.
10:06	2	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to	2	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the
10:06	2 3	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on	2 3	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for
10:06	2 3 4	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this.	2 3 4	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case.
10:06	2 3 4 5	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have	2 3 4 5	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay.
10:06	2 3 4 5 6	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and	2 3 4 5 6	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to
10:06	2 3 4 5 6 7	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is	2 3 4 5 6 7	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have
10:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out	2 3 4 5 6	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive. But Tarbela produces power at less than 1 cent per	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off, the implications of turning the plants off for flushing;
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive. But Tarbela produces power at less than 1 cent per kilowatt hour, US. Why? It's paid for. It's paid-for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off, the implications of turning the plants off for flushing; and (2) the downstream implications of releasing
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive. But Tarbela produces power at less than 1 cent per kilowatt hour, US. Why? It's paid for. It's paid-for infrastructure. All you're doing is operating it. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off, the implications of turning the plants off for flushing; and (2) the downstream implications of releasing sediment downstream. Because when you flush, you
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive. But Tarbela produces power at less than 1 cent per kilowatt hour, US. Why? It's paid for. It's paid-for infrastructure. All you're doing is operating it. And the operational cost of hydropower is the cheapest thing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off, the implications of turning the plants off for flushing; and (2) the downstream implications of releasing sediment downstream. Because when you flush, you basically are taking one year's worth of sediment and
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive. But Tarbela produces power at less than 1 cent per kilowatt hour, US. Why? It's paid for. It's paid-for infrastructure. All you're doing is operating it. And the operational cost of hydropower is the cheapest thing there is: it's cheaper than solar. Like I mentioned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off, the implications of turning the plants off for flushing; and (2) the downstream implications of releasing sediment downstream. Because when you flush, you basically are taking one year's worth of sediment and releasing it in a slug. If you're going to flush once
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive. But Tarbela produces power at less than 1 cent per kilowatt hour, US. Why? It's paid for. It's paid-for infrastructure. All you're doing is operating it. And the operational cost of hydropower is the cheapest thing there is: it's cheaper than solar. Like I mentioned yesterday, the plant that I was at in Peru, it's running	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off, the implications of turning the plants off for flushing; and (2) the downstream implications of releasing sediment downstream. Because when you flush, you basically are taking one year's worth of sediment and releasing it in a slug. If you're going to flush once a year, you're going to release all that sediment in,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive. But Tarbela produces power at less than 1 cent per kilowatt hour, US. Why? It's paid for. It's paid-for infrastructure. All you're doing is operating it. And the operational cost of hydropower is the cheapest thing there is: it's cheaper than solar. Like I mentioned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off, the implications of turning the plants off for flushing; and (2) the downstream implications of releasing sediment downstream. Because when you flush, you basically are taking one year's worth of sediment and releasing it in a slug. If you're going to flush once
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive. But Tarbela produces power at less than 1 cent per kilowatt hour, US. Why? It's paid for. It's paid-for infrastructure. All you're doing is operating it. And the operational cost of hydropower is the cheapest thing there is: it's cheaper than solar. Like I mentioned yesterday, the plant that I was at in Peru, it's running	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off, the implications of turning the plants off for flushing; and (2) the downstream implications of releasing sediment downstream. Because when you flush, you basically are taking one year's worth of sediment and releasing it in a slug. If you're going to flush once a year, you're going to release all that sediment in,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Just let me make one more point here. I'm going to talk about dredging in a minute, but since we're on this. In the Indus cascade, the three reservoirs, you have the Diamer-Bhasha, you have Dasu, Tarbela and Ghazi-Barotha, which is another 1,400 MW plant that is basically connected it takes the water that comes out of the turbines in Tarbela and passes them another 50 kilometres downstream. That's about 14,000 MW of capacity. You can't turn 14,000 MW off. I mean, the country won't have power. So what we're looking at is a way where we operate the top reservoirs to pass sediment down to Tarbela, and at Tarbela we use dredging. And dredging sounds like a crazy idea, and when I started studying Tarbela I said: dredging is a crazy idea, because it's too expensive. But Tarbela produces power at less than 1 cent per kilowatt hour, US. Why? It's paid for. It's paid-for infrastructure. All you're doing is operating it. And the operational cost of hydropower is the cheapest thing there is: it's cheaper than solar. Like I mentioned yesterday, the plant that I was at in Peru, it's running on 100-year-old equipment and it's producing power and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So I'd be interested in your reflections on just the relevance of what it is you're talking about for purposes of the case. DR MORRIS: Yes, okay. What I'm trying to do in this presentation is to give you an idea of the variety of options that we have in sediment management. And the Tarbela example is, I think, a good example because it shows that they looked at flushing here as the logical first thing you think about, and it turns out that it's not feasible because of the amount of power that you have to forgo. And this is a problem when you do flushing at any plant. Any plant. So in that respect, I know that India is very focused on doing flushing. But at the same time, we are not clear that they have really put into the equation two things: (1) the cost of turning those plants off, the implications of turning the plants off for flushing; and (2) the downstream implications of releasing sediment downstream. Because when you flush, you basically are taking one year's worth of sediment and releasing it in a slug. If you're going to flush once a year, you're going to release all that sediment in, what, a week?

10 (Pages 21 to 24)

10.10 1	Co those and the transfer of multi-real districtions	10.12 1	on the bottom. It discrete it into the true.
10:10 1	So these are the types of problems that are inherent	10:13 1	on the bottom. It diverts it into the tunnel and
2	in flushing as a strategy, and we'll go into that in	2	releases it about 3.5 kilometres downstream. I think
3	a couple of minutes. So like I said, I think it's	3	it's about a 3-kilometre tunnel, if I remember
4	relevant what happens in lots of different reservoirs	4	correctly.
5	because it shows that there's a lot of different	5	So bypass tunnels can be designed for bed material,
6	strategies available.	6	can be designed for suspended material. What I have
7	(Slide 34) Let me continue with this and just say	7	done in the projects we've worked with is design them
8	that the sediment routing techniques, we have off-stream	8	for suspended load rather than bed load, because the bed
9	storage, we have on-stream storage, we have bypass	9	load tends to degrade the invert of the tunnel.
10	tunnel or we can do a compartmented reservoir.	10	We do have an example in Pakistan, the Patrind
11	Compartmented doesn't really apply here because it's	11	project, which is not too far away from Neelum-Jhelum:
12	more for flat land with round reservoirs. And we can	12	it's about 100 kilometres, I think. It does incorporate
13	pass through, where we have turbidity currents or	13	a bypass tunnel. So it is something which now has been
14	drawdown sluicing.	14	used in the Himalaya.
15	(Slide 35) Off-channel storage is basically where	15	(Slide 39) Drawdown sluicing is a strategy by which
16	you use an intake to divert water into an off-stream	16	you open the gates of the reservoir during a flood
17	storage reservoir. This is in Colombia, it's in	17	event. Most of your sediment not most, but a large
18	a mountainous area of Colombia, and they have two	18	portion of your sediment, is delivered during flood
19	reservoirs in series. I worked with this project and	19	events. It depends on your hydrology. But, for
20	I just thought it was an interesting example.	20	instance, in the Caribbean, some areas of South America,
21	(Slide 36) This photograph is from the Tinguiririca	21	Taiwan, where you get typhoons and cyclones, you can get
22	project in Chile, where you have it's probably	22	half your annual sediment load in one or two days
23	4,000 metres elevation. I'm converting to it's	23	a year. In the Himalaya it's more spread out over time,
24	around 3,500 metres elevation. And they had the unique	24	but you still have these very large events that produce
25	situation in their topography where they could use	25	a lot of sediment.
	Page 25		Page 27
10:12 1	an off-stream storage.	10:15 1	And the objective in drawdown sluicing as seen in
2	The dam is actually right here: you can see the dam	2	part (B) of this slide, down at the bottom is to open
3	(indicating). It was affected by a debris flow event:	3	the gates when the flood is not yet arrived at the dam,
4	the dam was completely filled with sediment, boulders.	4	so if the dam is drawn down, and the flood can pass
5	But the off-stream reservoir retained its capacity, and	5	through it.
6	the operators insisted that they had had no problem and	6	Now, in the Himalaya, with a prolonged wet season,
7	they had not had appreciable sedimentation.	7	the strategy which is typically employed is to keep the
8	So it's a strategy which is not a general strategy,	8	gates open, keep the water level at the minimum
9	but there are places where it will work.	9	operating level which in the Treaty is called the
10	(Slide 37) The bypass tunnel, we have discussed that	10	"Dead Storage Level" and keep it at that level during
11	a little bit. But the objective of the bypass tunnel is	11	the entire wet season, because that changes your
12	to pass your sediment-laden flows around the zone that	12	reservoir, your pondage pool, into a river.
13	you're preserving for pondage uses. In my own work in	13	And instead of holding the water level at the top of
14	the Himalaya, I've found that this tends to be a good	14	the pondage pool, you drop it to the bottom of the
15	strategy for smaller reservoirs. It doesn't really pan	15	pondage pool. So the pondage pool is not accumulating
16	out for larger reservoirs, where we have longer tunnels,	16	sediment because it's empty. It will accumulate some
17	et cetera. And you can design these tunnels so they can	17	sediment because it's empty. It will accumulate some sediment upstream in the delta, but the pondage is empty
18	pass bed load, or they can pass suspended load only.	18	and therefore it's not going to accumulate sediment.
19	(Slide 38) This is an example from Japan. This is	19	And the area from the bottom of the pondage pool to
20	actually for a pumped storage project. This is the	20	the bottom of the reservoir is flowing as a river,
21	lower dam which is on the river, and then they have	21	particularly during the large events, so that you can
22	a higher reservoir which has only a very small	22	pass a 10- or 20-year flood at a high velocity, and
23	watershed. But this is at the upstream end of the	23	that's what maintains that profile.
24	reservoir. And the cofferdam, when they draw it down,	24	Basically, the difference between sediment flushing
25	the cofferdam diverts bed material. You see the gravel	25	and sediment routing is that this top one is the
	Page 26		Page 28

10:17 1			
	sediment sluicing. You see here? I'll get the cursor.	10:20 1	collected in the riverbed and it came up 3 or 4 metres.
2	During the dry season, the pondage pool gets filled, and	2	And we had to then have a secondary release of clear
3	the levels fluctuate up and down on a daily basis. And	3	water to help move this material downstream.
4	during the wet season, you drop the water level, and	4	So flushing is not just "Let me get the sediment out
5	maintain the water level at your minimum operating	5	of the reservoir"; it's "I've got to do something
6	level, which allows you to operate your turbines	6	downstream too".
7	throughout the year, you don't have to have the	7	The high flows during sluicing maximises the width
8	shutdown. And then at the end of your wet season, you	8	of the channel. Now, if you have a river, rivers have
9	refill and operate the pondage again.	9	a certain dimension, and those dimensions are created by
10	In contrast, flushing. You have these flushing	10	nature. And you have a low flow, and you have a little
11	events: maybe one, maybe two, maybe in extreme	11	river; and you have higher flows, you have a bigger
12	cases three per year. And you may operate the plant	12	·
13	at the maximum level, or you could also operate it at	13	geomorphically speaking, equivalent more or less to
14	a sluicing level. But the difference is that the	14	about a two-year discharge. Then it starts to overflow
15	flushing requires these deep drawdowns. And that is	15	into floodplains, et cetera.
16	where the issue with the Treaty comes in. So the top	16	When you have a reservoir that you're going to
17	one, because you're not drawing down below the dead	17	maintain by flushing or sluicing, you have to put as
18	storage level, is compliant, and the bottom one is not	18	much water as possible through it to make that wide
19	compliant.	19	enough. Because if you start flushing with a small
20	(Slide 40) The advantages of preserving capacity by	20	flow, you have essentially converted the river into
21	sluicing is that the power plant can remain in	21 22	a small river instead of a big river. Because, remember, the river is determined by your large flows:
22 23	operation, subject to sediment-guided operation. Remember we mentioned yesterday that some of these days		that gives you the dimension of the channel. And if you
23 24	have very high sediment loads, so there are going to be	23 24	flush with small flows, the channel dimension in your
25	a couple of days a year where you will probably want to	25	reservoir is going to be smaller. So sluicing allows
23	a couple of days a year where you will probably want to	23	reservoir is going to be smaller. So stutcing allows
	Page 29		Page 31
10:18 1	either turn the plant off or run at, say, half power.	10:21 1	you to pass the large floods through the reservoir and
2	Really important is the second item here: the	2	gives you the maximum width.
3	sediment that's released downstream is released over the	_	
5		3	- ·
4		3 4	Go ahead.
4 5	period of the wet season or by floods. That large	4	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the
5	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your	4 5	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular
5 6	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural	4 5 6	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like
5 6 7	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need	4 5 6 7	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing
5 6 7 8	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual	4 5 6	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in
5 6 7 8 9	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and	4 5 6 7 8	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities?
5 6 7 8	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets	4 5 6 7 8 9	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in
5 6 7 8 9	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and	4 5 6 7 8 9	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need
5 6 7 8 9 10	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you released downstream just settles into the river, and it	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name we want to apply I can put them at an elevation of
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you released downstream just settles into the river, and it settles into your irrigation canals or wherever.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name we want to apply I can put them at an elevation of 100 metres or 99 metres or 98 metres or 97 or 96 or 95:
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you released downstream just settles into the river, and it settles into your irrigation canals or wherever. And what we have seen in, for instance, Sanmenxia in China, on the Yellow River: they have had to release a significant amount of clear water after the flushing	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name we want to apply I can put them at an elevation of 100 metres or 99 metres or 98 metres or 97 or 96 or 95: I can move the gates down 1 metre at a time. And when
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you released downstream just settles into the river, and it settles into your irrigation canals or wherever. And what we have seen in, for instance, Sanmenxia in China, on the Yellow River: they have had to release	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name we want to apply I can put them at an elevation of 100 metres or 99 metres or 98 metres or 97 or 96 or 95: I can move the gates down 1 metre at a time. And when we do the simulations, that's basically what we do: we look at all the different levels, the types of control we get. So it's not really a black and white
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you released downstream just settles into the river, and it settles into your irrigation canals or wherever. And what we have seen in, for instance, Sanmenxia in China, on the Yellow River: they have had to release a significant amount of clear water after the flushing event so that this stuff moves downstream. When we did the flushing experiments at Warsak	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name we want to apply I can put them at an elevation of 100 metres or 99 metres or 98 metres or 97 or 96 or 95: I can move the gates down 1 metre at a time. And when we do the simulations, that's basically what we do: we look at all the different levels, the types of control we get. So it's not really a black and white demarcation: is this flushing or is this sluicing?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you released downstream just settles into the river, and it settles into your irrigation canals or wherever. And what we have seen in, for instance, Sanmenxia in China, on the Yellow River: they have had to release a significant amount of clear water after the flushing event so that this stuff moves downstream. When we did the flushing experiments at Warsak Reservoir in Pakistan two years ago, we did a rapid	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name we want to apply I can put them at an elevation of 100 metres or 99 metres or 98 metres or 97 or 96 or 95: I can move the gates down 1 metre at a time. And when we do the simulations, that's basically what we do: we look at all the different levels, the types of control we get. So it's not really a black and white demarcation: is this flushing or is this sluicing? The overall objective in sluicing is to maintain
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you released downstream just settles into the river, and it settles into your irrigation canals or wherever. And what we have seen in, for instance, Sanmenxia in China, on the Yellow River: they have had to release a significant amount of clear water after the flushing event so that this stuff moves downstream. When we did the flushing experiments at Warsak	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name we want to apply I can put them at an elevation of 100 metres or 99 metres or 98 metres or 97 or 96 or 95: I can move the gates down 1 metre at a time. And when we do the simulations, that's basically what we do: we look at all the different levels, the types of control we get. So it's not really a black and white demarcation: is this flushing or is this sluicing?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you released downstream just settles into the river, and it settles into your irrigation canals or wherever. And what we have seen in, for instance, Sanmenxia in China, on the Yellow River: they have had to release a significant amount of clear water after the flushing event so that this stuff moves downstream. When we did the flushing experiments at Warsak Reservoir in Pakistan two years ago, we did a rapid drawdown, we released a lot of sediment, and the sand	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name we want to apply I can put them at an elevation of 100 metres or 99 metres or 98 metres or 97 or 96 or 95: I can move the gates down 1 metre at a time. And when we do the simulations, that's basically what we do: we look at all the different levels, the types of control we get. So it's not really a black and white demarcation: is this flushing or is this sluicing? The overall objective in sluicing is to maintain flow downstream during flood events; you want to
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	period of the wet season or by floods. That large volume of water dilutes the sediment, so your concentrations remain within a more or less natural range, and it gives you the hydraulic capacity you need to move it downstream. When you flush on an annual basis, let's say, you get this big slug of sediment, and you can't just close the gates when the reservoir gets empty. In other words, imagine you draw the reservoir down, open the gates, empty it, it flushes out. Okay, I've released the sediment that I want to release from my reservoir, now I'm going to close the gate. But what happens when you close the gate: all that sediment you released downstream just settles into the river, and it settles into your irrigation canals or wherever. And what we have seen in, for instance, Sanmenxia in China, on the Yellow River: they have had to release a significant amount of clear water after the flushing event so that this stuff moves downstream. When we did the flushing experiments at Warsak Reservoir in Pakistan two years ago, we did a rapid	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Go ahead. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, are there circumstances in the Himalayas where, to deal with sediment at a particular site, you do find it necessary to use something like flushing, either as the exclusive means of addressing the sediment issue or as at least a partial means, in conjunction with other possibilities? DR MORRIS: That is a very interesting question, and I need to answer it in the following manner. You have flushing here on the left and sluicing here on the right, but there is this big area in between, and there is no fixed line that says, "This is flushing and this is sluicing". Because I can put my gates my sluicing gates or my flushing gates, whatever name we want to apply I can put them at an elevation of 100 metres or 99 metres or 98 metres or 97 or 96 or 95: I can move the gates down 1 metre at a time. And when we do the simulations, that's basically what we do: we look at all the different levels, the types of control we get. So it's not really a black and white demarcation: is this flushing or is this sluicing? The overall objective in sluicing is to maintain

12 (Pages 29 to 32)

10.22 *		10.25	
10:23 1	minimise deposition. Flushing, on the other hand, is	10:26 1	flushing, just because of where I've decided to locate
2	focusing on scouring previously deposited sediments and	2	the dam.
3	then releasing that downstream. When you do sluicing,	3	So there's two ways of approaching the design
4	you will get scour of previously deposited sediments.	4	problem. And for conceptual means, we'll just say we pick the powerhouse site, and we can put the dam
5	When you do flushing, you will get some sediment	5	
6	pass-through with whatever your flushing flow is. So it's really something of a misnomer to say that this is	6	upstream or we can put it downstream. But the consequences for sediment management are completely
7		7	different.
8	exactly sluicing or flushing. But what happens in the case of the Treaty is you	8	And I'll have a diagram of that on Thursday that
10	have a line which just says that: if you draw down below	10	will explain that maybe a little bit more clearly.
11	this level which is dead storage then we could	11	THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful, thank you. Please
12	consider it to be flushing; whereas if you can keep it	12	proceed.
13	to that level, we can consider it to be sluicing. But	13	DR MORRIS: Now, I did mention that you will get delta
14	some projects, there's very clear flushing; some	14	deposition when you do sluicing. But what we've seen in
15	projects, very clear sluicing. And some projects are:	15	the Himalaya, in the projects I've worked with
16	well, maybe, either way; you could describe it either	16	throughout the Himalaya, the bed material, the bed-load
17	way.	17	transport, is very low compared to suspended load. So
18	THE CHAIRMAN: I guess another way of putting my question	18	the delta deposition has not been a major issue for the
19	is: assuming we do have the Treaty constraints in place,	19	big material. The sand we can move. But the delta,
20	and assuming that they prohibit a particular type of	20	with moving big cobbles and gravels, has not been
21	deep orifice that would normally perhaps be used for	21	a significant problem.
22	flushing, are there circumstances where you, in	22	Disadvantages of sluicing: you have to have
23	complying with that requirement, would not be able to	23	a desander; and you're probably going to face increased
24	build a dam at a particular site; or will there always	24	turbine repair cost.
25	be, in your view, alternative means of sediment control	25	(Slide 42) One other thing that I think is important
	Page 33		Page 35
10:25 1	that could be employed?	10:28 1	to understand is, if you're going to have a let's
10:25 1 2	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot	2	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating),
	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this		call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water
2 3 4	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday.	2 3 4	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium
2 3 4 5	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that	2 3 4 5	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run
2 3 4 5 6	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse	2 3 4 5 6	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and
2 3 4 5 6 7	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us	2 3 4 5 6 7	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the flushing channel now is a small portion of the entire	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose. So it's just important to understand that if you do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the flushing channel now is a small portion of the entire width of your reservoir at the higher elevation, whereas	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose. So it's just important to understand that if you do have a defined profile and a defined water level, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the flushing channel now is a small portion of the entire width of your reservoir at the higher elevation, whereas initially it was occupying the full width of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose. So it's just important to understand that if you do have a defined profile and a defined water level, that you don't get anything extra by putting the outlet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the flushing channel now is a small portion of the entire width of your reservoir at the higher elevation, whereas initially it was occupying the full width of the reservoir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose. So it's just important to understand that if you do have a defined profile and a defined water level, that you don't get anything extra by putting the outlet deeper.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the flushing channel now is a small portion of the entire width of your reservoir at the higher elevation, whereas initially it was occupying the full width of the reservoir. So whereas on a given river, at one location for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose. So it's just important to understand that if you do have a defined profile and a defined water level, that you don't get anything extra by putting the outlet deeper. (Slide 43) Now, let's use just a quick example of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the flushing channel now is a small portion of the entire width of your reservoir at the higher elevation, whereas initially it was occupying the full width of the reservoir. So whereas on a given river, at one location for a power plant, I can put a small dam upstream and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose. So it's just important to understand that if you do have a defined profile and a defined water level, that you don't get anything extra by putting the outlet deeper. (Slide 43) Now, let's use just a quick example of a sluicing project. This is Kali Gandaki: it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the flushing channel now is a small portion of the entire width of your reservoir at the higher elevation, whereas initially it was occupying the full width of the reservoir. So whereas on a given river, at one location for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose. So it's just important to understand that if you do have a defined profile and a defined water level, that you don't get anything extra by putting the outlet deeper. (Slide 43) Now, let's use just a quick example of a sluicing project. This is Kali Gandaki: it's a small I'll put in parentheses "small" 144 MW
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the flushing channel now is a small portion of the entire width of your reservoir at the higher elevation, whereas initially it was occupying the full width of the reservoir. So whereas on a given river, at one location for a power plant, I can put a small dam upstream and control sedimentation; but if I move the dam downstream and make it a very tall dam, now I am forced to go to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose. So it's just important to understand that if you do have a defined profile and a defined water level, that you don't get anything extra by putting the outlet deeper. (Slide 43) Now, let's use just a quick example of a sluicing project. This is Kali Gandaki: it's a small I'll put in parentheses "small" 144 MW project in Nepal. But this is not a small river. When
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	DR MORRIS: Within the constraints of the Treaty, you cannot do anything you want at a site. And we'll get into this more on Thursday. But just imagine that if we have a small dam that we can sluice sediment, we can put the powerhouse downstream at the end of a tunnel, and that will give us 200 metres of head, let's say. But I can also make a very tall dam at the site of the powerhouse with a very short tunnel, and what I've done is I have converted my small and narrow reservoir into a very wide reservoir. Because remember, what we saw yesterday is, as you go deeper and deeper and deeper, you go up in elevation, the reservoir gets wider. So as it gets wider, this flushing channel, which is only going to be a certain width because you only have a certain discharge, the flushing channel now is a small portion of the entire width of your reservoir at the higher elevation, whereas initially it was occupying the full width of the reservoir. So whereas on a given river, at one location for a power plant, I can put a small dam upstream and control sedimentation; but if I move the dam downstream	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	call it a "sluicing level" at this level (indicating), that water level at the dam will define the water surface profile going upstream and the equilibrium profile for the sediment. You, for instance, run a hydraulic model or a sediment transport model, and what you define to run the model is that water level at the dam. So if I establish the water level at the dam, I can achieve that by, in this example, a crest-gated spillway or a deep orifice spillway. In both cases, the water level at the dam is the same, so my sediment profile will be the same, except that at the orifice spillway we'll have a steep scour cone, which is typically rather steep. In Tarbela, it's not so steep because it's a fine sediment. But if it's sand, it will be close to the angle of repose, the submerged angle of repose. So it's just important to understand that if you do have a defined profile and a defined water level, that you don't get anything extra by putting the outlet deeper. (Slide 43) Now, let's use just a quick example of a sluicing project. This is Kali Gandaki: it's a small I'll put in parentheses "small" 144 MW

13 (Pages 33 to 36)

10:30 1	we want to look at this and compare it to, say, the	10:33 1	(Slide 45) Now, another example, to move to the
2	rivers in the Treaty area, the sediment load here	10.33	other end of the scale, is Three Gorges in China,
3	we'll go to the next slide (44). Look at this number:	3	22,500 MW, the largest hydropower plant in the world.
	43 million tonnes a year. By comparison, the sediment		And they have a sediment load of 400 million tonnes.
4	The state of the s	4	
5	load of the Chenab at Baglihar is half of that. Chenab,	5	The reservoir is about 660 kilometres long.
6	20 million; Kali Gandaki, in the order of 40 million.	6	And they have an operating rule again based on
7	So this little project is managing twice the load	7	a sluicing process, whereby it's a multipurpose
8	that Baglihar gets. It's got a surface intake. It's	8	reservoir, but basically during the flood season, which
9	got a desander. They've had abrasion problems, which is	9	is in the summer in China, you have the water level at
10	one of the reasons why I was involved in this project	10	a low level for two purposes: (1) to sluice sediment, to
11	for several years, and different types of studies.	11	establish an equilibrium profile. The original studies
12	And this is a project that is located about	12	indicated that this profile would be established after
13	200 kilometres to the west of Kathmandu: it supplies the	13	and be fully stabilised within 100 years. They have
14	Pokhara area. And there was no good grid connection at	14	been revising the rule and optimising the project
15	the time. So the plant had to run 24/7 regardless,	15	operation. But they operate this year-round.
16	because it was the major plant supporting the grid for	16	So, smaller project, larger project, you can do
17	that area of the country.	17	this.
18	They did not have a good operator training	18	(Slide 46) Now let's take a comparative look at
19	programme. They were taking data; they weren't looking	19	flushing. What you do when you flush in the drawing
20	at the data. They did not have coated turbines. They	20	here you can see: this is your minimum operating level,
21	did not perform sediment-guided operation.	21	the dotted line you stop the turbines and then you
22	You can't see the intake here because it's buried	22	draw the reservoir down.
23	under I mean, this is the winter and it's high level.	23	And your rate of drawdown depends on two things:
24	But the intake had a kink in it. It was not in the	24	the dam. If it's an earthen dam, your drawdown rate
25	design; the contractor just built it that way, no one	25	will be low, because it will create instability within
	Page 37		Page 39
	Ç		Č
10:31 1	could figure out why. But that, of course, impaired	10:35 1	the dam if you draw it down quickly. It also depends on
10:31 1 2	could figure out why. But that, of course, impaired intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load	10:35 1 2	the dam if you draw it down quickly. It also depends on the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir
2	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load	2	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir
2 3	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which	2 3	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding
2 3 4	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen.	2 3 4	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that
2 3 4 5	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that	2 3 4 5	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the
2 3 4 5 6	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom	2 3 4 5 6	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed	2 3 4 5 6 7	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During the wet season, the desanders are operating to take out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground. So this whole process takes time, and it's time that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During the wet season, the desanders are operating to take out sediment. During the dry season, you don't even have to use them because there's basically no sediment in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground. So this whole process takes time, and it's time that the turbines will not be operating. As I mentioned, in the case of Tarbela, it was a minimum of 30 days.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During the wet season, the desanders are operating to take out sediment. During the dry season, you don't even have to use them because there's basically no sediment in the river. If you've seen Himalayan rivers in the winter,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground. So this whole process takes time, and it's time that the turbines will not be operating. As I mentioned, in the case of Tarbela, it was a minimum of 30 days. The flushing events, because they do release a lot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During the wet season, the desanders are operating to take out sediment. During the dry season, you don't even have to use them because there's basically no sediment in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground. So this whole process takes time, and it's time that the turbines will not be operating. As I mentioned, in the case of Tarbela, it was a minimum of 30 days.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During the wet season, the desanders are operating to take out sediment. During the dry season, you don't even have to use them because there's basically no sediment in the river. If you've seen Himalayan rivers in the winter, they're beautiful: they're just crystal-clear, beautiful. So in the load on this project, the sediment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground. So this whole process takes time, and it's time that the turbines will not be operating. As I mentioned, in the case of Tarbela, it was a minimum of 30 days. The flushing events, because they do release a lot of sediment in a short period of time, you will typically have to deploy under the procedures, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During the wet season, the desanders are operating to take out sediment. During the dry season, you don't even have to use them because there's basically no sediment in the river. If you've seen Himalayan rivers in the winter, they're beautiful: they're just crystal-clear,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground. So this whole process takes time, and it's time that the turbines will not be operating. As I mentioned, in the case of Tarbela, it was a minimum of 30 days. The flushing events, because they do release a lot of sediment in a short period of time, you will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During the wet season, the desanders are operating to take out sediment. During the dry season, you don't even have to use them because there's basically no sediment in the river. If you've seen Himalayan rivers in the winter, they're beautiful: they're just crystal-clear, beautiful. So in the load on this project, the sediment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground. So this whole process takes time, and it's time that the turbines will not be operating. As I mentioned, in the case of Tarbela, it was a minimum of 30 days. The flushing events, because they do release a lot of sediment in a short period of time, you will typically have to deploy under the procedures, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During the wet season, the desanders are operating to take out sediment. During the dry season, you don't even have to use them because there's basically no sediment in the river. If you've seen Himalayan rivers in the winter, they're beautiful: they're just crystal-clear, beautiful. So in the load on this project, the sediment load would fill the reservoir with sand within a couple of months in the monsoon. So it handles a large load.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground. So this whole process takes time, and it's time that the turbines will not be operating. As I mentioned, in the case of Tarbela, it was a minimum of 30 days. The flushing events, because they do release a lot of sediment in a short period of time, you will typically have to deploy under the procedures, you will have to deploy a mitigation and monitoring team. Depending on your regulatory environment, you may have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	intake efficiency in excluding sand. Of the total load coming into the turbines here, 43% was sand, which should never happen. And the desanders also had a hydraulic roller that was vertical. The water would come in, go to the bottom and then come back up again, which we again discussed yesterday. So the objective of this project, which was World Bank-financed, was to modify and correct a number of deficiencies so that this project would operate better. But here's a project on a river twice the sediment load of the Chenab, surface intake, sluicing, and it works. And the operating rule is like this: the sediment concentration goes up as soon as you drop the level down, because it now starts to flow as a river. During the wet season, the desanders are operating to take out sediment. During the dry season, you don't even have to use them because there's basically no sediment in the river. If you've seen Himalayan rivers in the winter, they're beautiful: they're just crystal-clear, beautiful. So in the load on this project, the sediment load would fill the reservoir with sand within a couple	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the stability of the banks. Because when the reservoir is up high, of course, all the rock and soil surrounding the reservoir is full of water, and if you drop that rapidly, this water, as it drains out, so to speak, the pressure will cause, or can cause, collapsing of the sides of the reservoir. So you have a drawdown rate. Then you get the reservoir empty and you have a period of flushing. And as the sediments remove, the water level can gradually go down, and then you have to refill the reservoir and then you can restart the turbines. But of course at the end of this flushing event, you will also have to be releasing some water downstream. You're not going to empty the river: you're not going to turn the gates off and the fish will be out there flopping on the ground. So this whole process takes time, and it's time that the turbines will not be operating. As I mentioned, in the case of Tarbela, it was a minimum of 30 days. The flushing events, because they do release a lot of sediment in a short period of time, you will typically have to deploy under the procedures, you will have to deploy a mitigation and monitoring team.

14 (Pages 37 to 40)

,			
10:36 1	a rather large team: you may have 50 people in the	10:39 1	cascade has certain advantages and certain
2	field. And you may have follow-up activities,	2	disadvantages.
3	et cetera.	3	The thing I had mentioned previously on the bottom
4	(Slide 47) So the procedure is schematically	4	right-hand, here on slide 48, is: the flushing channel,
5	illustrated here, where the river enters the reservoir,	5	the width will be limited. And in the bottom left-hand
6	picks up sediment and delivers the sediment downstream,	6	corner of that graphic, you can see the it's
7	and this concentration of the sediment in the water is	7	a regime-type equation that was basically worked out for
8	typically in excess of 100,000 milligrams per litre.	8	reservoirs in primarily silty sediments; it's from
9	When we did Warsak, which is an Indus distributary that	9	China.
10	comes out of Afghanistan instead of coming out of	10	There's an article by Kantoush in Japan looking at
11	Kashmir, we hit concentrations of 130,000 milligrams per	11	Japanese reservoirs which have more gravel: the channel
12	litre. So the second flushing we did, we lowered the	12	will be about half this width.
13	rate of decline so we could control the maximum	13	But the end message here is that channel width is
14	concentrations, which of course elongates your flushing	14	limited. So if you have a tall reservoir, very wide,
15	period.	15	your flushing channel is going to be limited.
16	So you're going to be limited in your drawdown rate	16	And finally, because we have the problem of having
17	not only by the reservoir and by the dam conditions, but	17	the sediment load concentrated in time, it can produce
18	also by the sediment concentration that you can release	18	a lot of downstream consequences. And one of the
19	downstream.	19	reasons that flushing in many jurisdictions is basically
20	100,000 milligrams per litre will kill most things	20	infeasible is because of downstream impacts.
21	in the river, if it's sustained. And if you have	21	(Slide 49) Here, just giving an example, the
22	a downstream filter plant, it's not going to be	22	regulatory guidance letter from the US Corps of
23	operable. If you have downstream irrigation canals,	23	Engineers (P-612), which I think has been introduced
24	they will fill with the sediment, the canals will fill	24 25	into the record. It basically makes a differentiation
25	with sediment. So there's a lot of things to consider	23	between sluicing and flushing.
	Page 41		Page 43
10.00		10.44	V
10:38 1	here. It's not just: we'll open the gates and the	10:41 1	Now, in the United States, if you have to get
2	problem is solved.	2	an Army Corps of Engineers permit, that is like the worst thing that can happen. Basically, it's a permit
3 4	(Slide 48) When we talk about capacity preservation by flushing, when you flush through a cascade when	3	
5	you have a cascade, you need to flush through the	4 5	that involves all your federal agencies and typically goes through all of your state agencies also. So all
6	cascade. It doesn't really help you a lot if you're	6	the agencies have to get on board and agree with what
7	going to flush out of one reservoir and then just	7	you're going to do, including National Marine Fisheries,
8	deposit it in the next one downstream. You need to take	8	Fish and Wildlife Service, Environmental Protection
9	advantage of the operation. So you're going to probably	9	Agency, plus all of your local agencies. And there's
10	be having all of these reservoirs out of service at the	10	also a public review process. So you have a lot of
11	same time. Which, as I mentioned, was why we looked at	11	fingers in the pie, and it's a difficult, time-consuming
12	dredging at Tarbela, because if we were to release	12	and costly process.
13	sediment from the upstream reservoirs, taking the plants	13	Sluicing is exempted. It's exempted because look
14	out of service, Tarbela can remain in operation.	14	at the bottom. I think it got cut off when they
15	Also if you have an upstream dam, you can control	15	reformatted this, but it says "sluicing structures that
16	releases, and therefore create artificial flushing flows	16	mimic the natural increase of sediment in a stream",
17	for the downstream dam. For instance, along the Chenab,	17	where the sediment that's discharged through the
18	India has proposed the Pakal Dul storage dam upstream.	18	structure basically follows the natural pattern, is
19	And that can be used for two things: it can be used to	19	exempted from having to get the permit. Because this is
20	generate the flows that will pass through all the	20	basically a dredging permit. Flushing is considered to
21	downstream run-of-river plants, basically using the	21	be dredging; sluicing is not, because your sluicing is
22	storage plant as a big pondage pool; and also you can	22	trying to mimic the natural pattern.
23	generate flows for sediment management downstream.	23	So to have a prohibition against flushing is
24	So being able to control the downstream hydrology	24	actually not unusual.
25	is, of course, an advantage of a cascade. So the	25	(Slide 50) Now, let's talk about dredging real
	Page 42		Page 44

10:43 1	quick.	10:46 1	your power purchase agreement it's a contract for the
2	This is the Bajo Anchicayá project in Colombia, and	2	sale of power, and that will typically have obligations
3	I worked on this project about ten years ago. It's	3	to deliver; and if you don't deliver, you may have
4	a small 74 MW project. It's on the Pacific drainage of	4	additional cost that you have to pay. And these other
5	Colombia. And they had a flushing event, and it created	5	factors, plus all the downstream costs, all factor into
6	a lot of downstream problems in terms of social issues.	6	the decision of whether or not to flush, how to do it,
7	There are some very special social issues in this area:	7	and how to draw the reservoir down and how to move the
8	there are indigenous tribes which have a lot of	8	sediment downstream.
9	protection in Colombian law, et cetera. So they were	9	Dredging does not require interruption of power
10	faced with regulatory actions, lawsuits, and this is	10	production. Sluicing minimises the interruption of
11	still ongoing after decades.	11	power production. Flushing does require emptying:
12	But they started dredging here in 1962. This is, as	12	a rather prolonged shutdown of the power plant. And you
13	far as I have seen anywhere in the world, the longest	13	also have the problem of the downstream sediment
14	continuous dredging project in any reservoir. They've	14	release.
15	been continuously dredging since 1962. And the	15	(Slide 52) So your selection of a sediment
16	interesting thing is that if you compare the amount	16	management strategy depends on your site hydrology; your
17	dredged here per year and they use two dredges.	17	physical features: site, sediment load; your drawdown
18	You can see this is a suction cutter-head dredge	18	rate; the plant head; the type of turbine that you're
19	5	19	
	that discharges into a tunnel right about here		going to be using; how quickly you can repair it. And
20	(indicating), just upstream of the dam, which discharges	20	it also depends on your socioeconomic environment: your
21	just below the dam. And not visible in the photograph,	21	legal, your regulatory environment, which is especially
22	but upstream, is what they call a Sauerman dredge, which	22	relevant to flushing; the sensitivity of the downstream
23	is like a dragline. But it's not a dragline that's on	23	environment; the slope of the river; can the sediment be
24	a tracked vehicle: it's a permanently installed dragline	24	transported; ecological richness.
25	that goes out, collects sediment, and dumps it also into	25	Spawning beds: you release sediment into spawning
	Page 45		Page 47
10:44 1	the same tunnel. So the dragline picks up the larger	10:48 1	beds, the sediment will accumulate in the spawning
10:44 1 2	the same tunnel. So the dragline picks up the larger material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head	10:48 1 2	beds, the sediment will accumulate in the spawning gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water
	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand.		gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon
2	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres	2	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water
2	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like	2 3	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen.
2 3 4	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you	2 3 4	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with
2 3 4 5	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts	2 3 4 5	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera.
2 3 4 5 6	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you	2 3 4 5 6	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this
2 3 4 5 6 7	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the	2 3 4 5 6 7	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but here's an example where it is feasible. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but here's an example where it is feasible. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high sediment load and low sediment load, and you design for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but here's an example where it is feasible. And I explained: even on very large scale, it is an option, and even in the Himalaya. (Slide 51) So to close this part of the discussion,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high sediment load and low sediment load, and you design for the high loads. So if your climate is going to change your sediment load, you're already designing for high load. You don't design a project saying, "Well, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but here's an example where it is feasible. And I explained: even on very large scale, it is an option, and even in the Himalaya.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high sediment load and low sediment load, and you design for the high loads. So if your climate is going to change your sediment load, you're already designing for high
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but here's an example where it is feasible. And I explained: even on very large scale, it is an option, and even in the Himalaya. (Slide 51) So to close this part of the discussion,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high sediment load and low sediment load, and you design for the high loads. So if your climate is going to change your sediment load, you're already designing for high load. You don't design a project saying, "Well, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but here's an example where it is feasible. And I explained: even on very large scale, it is an option, and even in the Himalaya. (Slide 51) So to close this part of the discussion, dredging, sluicing, flushing: a lot goes into taking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high sediment load and low sediment load, and you design for the high loads. So if your climate is going to change your sediment load, you're already designing for high load. You don't design a project saying, "Well, the sediment load is always going to be average", because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but here's an example where it is feasible. And I explained: even on very large scale, it is an option, and even in the Himalaya. (Slide 51) So to close this part of the discussion, dredging, sluicing, flushing: a lot goes into taking into account the production cost and the cost of forgone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high sediment load and low sediment load, and you design for the high loads. So if your climate is going to change your sediment load, you're already designing for high load. You don't design a project saying, "Well, the sediment load is always going to be average", because it's not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but here's an example where it is feasible. And I explained: even on very large scale, it is an option, and even in the Himalaya. (Slide 51) So to close this part of the discussion, dredging, sluicing, flushing: a lot goes into taking into account the production cost and the cost of forgone production of power and the downstream impacts. If you have dispatch availability and problems with your PPA,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high sediment load and low sediment load, and you design for the high loads. So if your climate is going to change your sediment load, you're already designing for high load. You don't design a project saying, "Well, the sediment load is always going to be average", because it's not. The Treaty doesn't allocate water: the Treaty allocates watersheds. So we had discussions of: how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	material gravels and cobbles and the cutter-head dredge picks up gravels and sand. The dredging quantity of 528,000 cubic metres a year, divided by your 74 MW, gives you something like 7,000 metres per MW, or some number like that. If you apply that to the 900 MW Baglihar plant, this converts into something on the order of about 9 million cubic metres a year of dredging. And if you look at the overall sediment load from Baglihar, you're talking about being able to this is equivalent to having a dredge in Baglihar which would dredge something like 40% of the total inflowing load. And of course, part of your load is going to go through your turbines anyway, and part of the load is going to go over the dam when you have the big flood. So everybody says dredging is not feasible, but here's an example where it is feasible. And I explained: even on very large scale, it is an option, and even in the Himalaya. (Slide 51) So to close this part of the discussion, dredging, sluicing, flushing: a lot goes into taking into account the production cost and the cost of forgone production of power and the downstream impacts. If you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	gravels, and that blocks the flow of oxygenated water where the fish lay their eggs. For instance, a salmon lays eggs in gravel; the gravel gets coated with sediment; the eggs will die because there's no oxygen. Social sensitivity to sediment downstream. And downstream infrastructure: canals, intakes, et cetera. (Slide 53) Now, I would just like to close this section with making a couple of comments on climate change. I know that that's of interest here. And I would just like to point out that when you design in this environment, you're thinking about climate change. And in the projects that I've worked with in the Himalaya, and especially bank-financed projects, climate change is always a big deal. But there's a couple of things here. When you look at design, you have years of high sediment load and low sediment load, and you design for the high loads. So if your climate is going to change your sediment load, you're already designing for high load. You don't design a project saying, "Well, the sediment load is always going to be average", because it's not. The Treaty doesn't allocate water: the Treaty

16 (Pages 45 to 48)

10 40 1		10.52 1 About helf of more also well allowed with about
10:49 1	2	10:53 1 About half of my work is remedial work with plants
2		that have problems, and what we see repeatedly is that
3	5 11	people just weren't thinking, they weren't cognisant.
4	, 8	4 It's something that they aren't really accustomed to
5		5 working with, because you go to school and you learn
6	, , ,	6 about steel and concrete and hydraulics, but sediment
7		7 isn't in the regular curriculum. So it's something
8		8 that, when you put your mind to it, you can solve it.
9		9 Where there's a will, there's a way.
10	1	Both methods, sluicing and flushing, have advantages
11	3	and disadvantages. And I would also like to say that
12		a lot of progress has been made in the recent decades in
13	•	the areas of coatings and better understanding how to
14		management sediment. From when I started working in
15		this field to today, huge advances have been made.
16	1 1 2 1	So I would just like to close by saying that a lot
17	1 1 1	of options are available, and we are not locked into
18	•	18 "This is the way to do it".
19	• •	So with that I will close, and maybe there's more
20	•	20 questions. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.
21 22	, ,	22 (10.54 am)
23		23 Questions from THE COURT
24		24 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you very much, Dr Morris. Again,
25		25 a very clear presentation. I've got a few questions.
2.	equitable, in a way, even when enhance change comes down	25 a very creat presentation. The got a few questions.
	Page 49	Page 51
10.51		10.54 4 26 1 1
10:51	, 1 2 2	10:54 1 My first one relates to this concept of
2	similar types of problems to deal with.	2 weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it
2	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is	 weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create
2	2 similar types of problems to deal with. 3 It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context.
3	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology,	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan.
2 3 2 5	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down.	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English,	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this,
2 3 5 6 5 8 9 10 1	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 11 12	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem.	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 11 12	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya,	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 12 14	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the spectrum.	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when
12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the spectrum. I should mention that I showed you that table at the	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when we've looked at the flood-control capacity of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the spectrum. I should mention that I showed you that table at the beginning with all the different methods: in my	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when we've looked at the flood-control capacity of the downstream barrages in Pakistan, it looks like we have
10 11 12 12 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the spectrum. I should mention that I showed you that table at the beginning with all the different methods: in my professional career, I have worked with all of them at	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when we've looked at the flood-control capacity of the downstream barrages in Pakistan, it looks like we have the capacity to manage the flood.
22 33 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the spectrum. I should mention that I showed you that table at the beginning with all the different methods: in my professional career, I have worked with all of them at different projects in different locations. So I'm not	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when we've looked at the flood-control capacity of the downstream barrages in Pakistan, it looks like we have the capacity to manage the flood. So the flood is an issue which is not as worrying as
22 33 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the spectrum. I should mention that I showed you that table at the beginning with all the different methods: in my professional career, I have worked with all of them at different projects in different locations. So I'm not here to say, "This is the way to do it", or, "This other	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when we've looked at the flood-control capacity of the downstream barrages in Pakistan, it looks like we have the capacity to manage the flood. So the flood is an issue which is not as worrying as the interruption of supply. Because if you can imagine
22 33 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 11 11 12 11 12 12 12 13 14 14 15 16 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the spectrum. I should mention that I showed you that table at the beginning with all the different methods: in my professional career, I have worked with all of them at different projects in different locations. So I'm not here to say, "This is the way to do it", or, "This other way is the way to do it". There's a lot of things that	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when we've looked at the flood-control capacity of the downstream barrages in Pakistan, it looks like we have the capacity to manage the flood. So the flood is an issue which is not as worrying as the interruption of supply. Because if you can imagine running an irrigation system where you have three or
22 33 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22 22	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the spectrum. I should mention that I showed you that table at the beginning with all the different methods: in my professional career, I have worked with all of them at different projects in different locations. So I'm not here to say, "This is the way to do it", or, "This other way is the way to do it". There's a lot of things that can be done, there's a lot of options.	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when we've looked at the flood-control capacity of the downstream barrages in Pakistan, it looks like we have the capacity to manage the flood. So the flood is an issue which is not as worrying as the interruption of supply. Because if you can imagine running an irrigation system where you have three or four weeks of no water, and then all of a sudden it all comes in a spike, and then you have another two or
22 33 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22 22	similar types of problems to deal with. It does make it clear though that the Treaty is focused on sustaining the hydrology coming into Pakistan. And if there is a change in that hydrology, it doesn't change, let's say, the obligation or the need for Pakistan to receive the waters as it naturally comes down. (Slide 54) So just to conclude. I hope I have been able to have you understand that there's a lot of ways of focusing and solving sediment issues. In English, we'd say there's I mean, American; I don't know if it's an expression over here but there's many ways to skin a cat. There are many ways to approach a problem. And sluicing and flushing are both viable methods, no doubt about it. And they can both work in the Himalaya, and I have worked on projects on both ends of the spectrum. I should mention that I showed you that table at the beginning with all the different methods: in my professional career, I have worked with all of them at different projects in different locations. So I'm not here to say, "This is the way to do it", or, "This other way is the way to do it". There's a lot of things that	weaponisation of infrastructure: essentially, call it the on-purpose management of infrastructure to create downstream harm, which is a concern in this context. It has been brought up mostly in the context of India switching off the water towards Pakistan. But from a sediment perspective, can you think of any scenarios where sediment is managed in such a way that it might create substantial downstream harm? DR MORRIS: Water and sediment travel at different velocities down a river. And when we've looked at this, the principal problem for Pakistan will we expect it to be the interruption of supply. There's a second problem: that because the dams have for instance, Baglihar has very large gates, you can pass large, large floods, and you can open those gates and create flood conditions downstream. But when we've looked at the flood-control capacity of the downstream barrages in Pakistan, it looks like we have the capacity to manage the flood. So the flood is an issue which is not as worrying as the interruption of supply. Because if you can imagine running an irrigation system where you have three or four weeks of no water, and then all of a sudden it all

10:56		three weeks with no water, you're not going to be	10:59 1	1 3 3 1 3
	2	successful in your irrigation scheme.	2	
	3	The third that you mentioned here is sediment. Now,	3	
	4	the sediment, when it's released, it will flow	4	•
	5	downstream. But in the case, for instance, of the	5	1 31 1 ,
	6	Chenab, the sediment will go through the Salal project	6	1 ,
	7	in India first. So the Salal project in India would be	7	
	8	the very first to be impacted and would receive the	8	
	9	biggest impacts of any downstream infrastructure.	9	1
	10	So it seems that, yes, the sediment well, let me	10	
	11	go back a little bit.	11	*
	12	As the sediment is released, it tends to deposit on	12	
	13	the riverbed. And what we've seen in the experiments at	13 14	
	14 15	Warsak, we monitored bridges at different distances from the dam, up to, I think it was, about 35 kilometres	15	· ·
	16	downstream, and the sediment concentrations decreased	16	• 1 5
	17	going downstream. Because sediments are being	17	1 0
	18	deposited, basically, on the riverbed; some of it goes	18	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	19	into your irrigation canals.	19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	20	So the sediment arriving in Pakistan will probably	20	
	21	be the number three problem, rather than the number one	21	
	22	problem. The number one problem is the interruption of	22	* *
	23	the water supply; number two is the flood. And of	23	•
	24	course the interruption means you'll have, like, zero	24	
	25	flow or a greatly reduced flow and then a peak, and	25	* *
				Ç
		Page 53		Page 55
10:57	1	then you know, there is the potential to do that. So	11:00 1	Again, one of the slides that's not in the
	2	it's interruption of supply; number two would be	2	presentation here is the Jagran plant in Kashmir, in
	3	flooding; and number three would be the sediment	3	Pakistan, 30 MW, which was affected by a debris flow.
	4	release. And particularly because, on the Chenab in	4	You had boulders coming over the dam. But in this case
	5	particular, India would be more affected: they would be	5	it was designed for this type of event. You have a low
	6	basically inundating their own plant with sediment.	6	dam, an ungated crest spillway. And then, looking
	7	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you very much.	7	downstream, on the left-hand side you have a couple of
	8	Another question relates to the last point you	8	sluice gates in front of the intake. Just pure
	9	mentioned on climate change. I believe you mentioned	9	run-of-river; they don't have pondage at this plant.
	10	yesterday GLOFs and LLOFs, which do occur in mountainous	10	And the event came through; the sediment, including the
	11	environments, including the Himalayas, and are likely to	11	boulders, went over the spillway. They came back with
	12	increase in intensity and frequency under conditions of	12	a bulldozer, cleared out the area in front of the
	13	climate change.	13	
	14	So far, how big has the impact of GLOFs and LLOFs been in managing dams and reservoirs in this region?	14	
	15 16	And what is your view on the potential increase in risk	15 16	to the river and the switchyard got wiped out, along
	17	as a result of climate change and changing environmental	16	with a mosque that had been there for 120 years. So it was an extraordinary event. But the dam was not
	18	conditions more generally?	17	materially damaged; and of course the powerhouse, which
		DR MORRIS: If you read some of the information that comes	19	was an underground powerhouse, was completely intact.
	20	out in the media, you will know that some of the Indian	20	
	21	projects some large Indian projects, in fact have	21	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, I think that's a very
	22	been impacted.	22	helpful example. More generally, would you design a dam
	23	There was a project on the Teesta River which was	23	very differently if you knew that GLOFs and LLOFs were
	24	impacted by I can't remember if it was a GLOF or	24	
	25	a landslide lake flood. But a 1,200 MW project. The	25	DR MORRIS: Yes, you have to understand what your risks are
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		Page 54		Page 56

11:02 1	and you have to plan for them and you have to design for	11:05 1 typically at the point of, "This is where you want to
2	them.	2 build it"; maybe not at this exact spot, but move it up
3	Like I had said at the beginning, engineering is	3 and down a kilometre, or something like that. You've
4	a very fascinating profession. Every project is its own	4 got a general idea of where you want to put it.
5	little problem, or big problem: your physical factors,	5 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you very much. I certainly did
6	your problems with regulatory limitations; there's all	6 not expect a straightforward answer. But your views are
7	types of things. But you put your mind to it and the	7 very, very helpful nevertheless. Thank you.
8	solutions will come up. But there are sites that you	8 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear.
9	shouldn't build on.	9 MR MINEAR: Dr Morris, thank you for your presentation.
10	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.	10 I have a question related to Dr Buytaert's first
11	My last question is a bit more conceptual in nature.	11 question about sediment management.
12	If you have a valley with hydropower potential and	12 As I recall, Neelum-Jhelum is downstream from
13	you're looking for installing a certain capacity, and	Kishenganga. Would sediment management at Kishengangaaffect the operation of Neelum-Jhelum?
14 15	you have the option between fewer large plants or more smaller plants and obviously there are many	15 DR MORRIS: Yes, because Kishenganga is currently
16	considerations that would influence that decision but	16 accumulating sediment. In our office, we simulated
17	from a sediment perspective, would you be able to say:	17 Kishenganga, what, 15 years ago, as part of the first
18	well, we'd rather go for fewer large plants or more	18 case, and at that time we were anticipating that it
19	smaller plants? Is there a general trend towards which	19 would come into sediment balance after more or less
20	of those is easier to manage from a sediment	20 40-50 years, something in that range; I don't remember
21	perspective?	21 the exact number.
22	DR MORRIS: That's a question that doesn't have really	22 But Kishenganga is quite a distance upstream of
23	a good answer. You can, of course, management sediment	Neelum-Jhelum. So with respect to the bed load, bed
24	appropriately in either case.	24 material, you will not see it at Neelum-Jhelum, you will
25	In general, the larger plants tend to be less costly	not be able to measure it. With respect to suspended
	Page 57	Page 59
	1 0,50 37	Luge 37
11:03 1	on a per-megawatt basis. Maybe even, if you compare	11:07 1 load, you may see something, but it is only a portion of
11:03 1 2	on a per-megawatt basis. Maybe even, if you compare a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half	11:07 1 load, you may see something, but it is only a portion of the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at
	on a per-megawatt basis. Maybe even, if you compare a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're	
2	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half	2 the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at
2 3	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're	 the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or
2 3 4	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And	 the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact.
2 3 4 5	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project.	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size.	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants.	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer.	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer. But the other thing is that as an engineer, you're	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer.	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is, it would be a reduction in sediment for the next several
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer. But the other thing is that as an engineer, you're never given a river: you're typically given a segment of	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is, it would be a reduction in sediment for the next several decades.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer. But the other thing is that as an engineer, you're never given a river: you're typically given a segment of a river or a site. And the planning stage in many of	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is, it would be a reduction in sediment for the next several decades. MR MINEAR: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer. But the other thing is that as an engineer, you're never given a river: you're typically given a segment of a river or a site. And the planning stage in many of these rivers was done many years ago, like 60 years ago.	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is, it would be a reduction in sediment for the next several decades. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, you mentioned the possibility of cascades of dams in the context of sediment management. And I was wondering if you could step back from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer. But the other thing is that as an engineer, you're never given a river: you're typically given a segment of a river or a site. And the planning stage in many of these rivers was done many years ago, like 60 years ago. And maybe the question is: should we replan this, based on, for instance, high dam/short tunnel, versus low dam and longer tunnel? Those types of questions, which are	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is, it would be a reduction in sediment for the next several decades. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, you mentioned the possibility of cascades of dams in the context of sediment management. And I was wondering if you could step back from the sediment control context and just say something about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer. But the other thing is that as an engineer, you're never given a river: you're typically given a segment of a river or a site. And the planning stage in many of these rivers was done many years ago, like 60 years ago. And maybe the question is: should we replan this, based on, for instance, high dam/short tunnel, versus low dam and longer tunnel? Those types of questions, which are more overall questions.	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is, it would be a reduction in sediment for the next several decades. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, you mentioned the possibility of cascades of dams in the context of sediment management. And I was wondering if you could step back from the sediment control context and just say something about whether there are inherent limits on the building of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer. But the other thing is that as an engineer, you're never given a river: you're typically given a segment of a river or a site. And the planning stage in many of these rivers was done many years ago, like 60 years ago. And maybe the question is: should we replan this, based on, for instance, high dam/short tunnel, versus low dam and longer tunnel? Those types of questions, which are	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is, it would be a reduction in sediment for the next several decades. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, you mentioned the possibility of cascades of dams in the context of sediment management. And I was wondering if you could step back from the sediment control context and just say something about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer. But the other thing is that as an engineer, you're never given a river: you're typically given a segment of a river or a site. And the planning stage in many of these rivers was done many years ago, like 60 years ago. And maybe the question is: should we replan this, based on, for instance, high dam/short tunnel, versus low dam and longer tunnel? Those types of questions, which are more overall questions.	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is, it would be a reduction in sediment for the next several decades. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, you mentioned the possibility of cascades of dams in the context of sediment management. And I was wondering if you could step back from the sediment control context and just say something about whether there are inherent limits on the building of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a 1,000 MW versus a 20 MW, you're maybe looking at half the cost per megawatt. But your 1,000 MW plant, you're looking at \$1.5 billion: that's a big nut to crack. And if you have a problem for instance, the one I mentioned in the Teesta River, where they have a 1,200 MW plant, the dam is gone you have a lot of investment in one project. So I don't think that there is what you could call a good answer to that. My preference, if I was going to work on it, if I was given a pristine river, I would select plants which are probably moderate in size. I would not try to do a 3,000 MW plant to do the whole river, and I wouldn't certainly do 30/20 MW plants. Either extreme is probably too extreme. But I know it's not a really good answer. But the other thing is that as an engineer, you're never given a river: you're typically given a segment of a river or a site. And the planning stage in many of these rivers was done many years ago, like 60 years ago. And maybe the question is: should we replan this, based on, for instance, high dam/short tunnel, versus low dam and longer tunnel? Those types of questions, which are more overall questions. But by the time your design engineer comes, it's	the entire watershed. And so the sediment management at Kishenganga will probably not have an appreciable or significant impact. It may have a measurable impact, if we had good measurements. But in this part of the world, we don't have, like, United States Geological Survey quality stations that have been running data for 30 years. We don't have that. So it would be difficult, within all the variability that we see, to pick out, "Well, this is what the condition was before Kishenganga, and this is the condition after". So it's probably not something that they would be able to even measure at this point. So, yes, from the standpoint of sediment water is completely different. But from the standpoint of sediment, probably not much impact. And if there is, it would be a reduction in sediment for the next several decades. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Morris, you mentioned the possibility of cascades of dams in the context of sediment management. And I was wondering if you could step back from the sediment control context and just say something about whether there are inherent limits on the building of a cascade of dams in the Himalayas.

19 (Pages 57 to 60)

11:08 1	And by that I mean: are there reasons why at	11:41 1	an integrated power system.
2	a certain point you can't continue to do a cascade, for	2	(Slide 2) The objective today is to explain power
3	reasons of sediment but also just hydrology? Or is it	3	systems in general, and how a run-of-river hydropower
4	the case that you can design these dams in a way that	4	project is used in that power system. I will also
5	you can have almost an unlimited number on the same	5	comment on the evolution of power systems and power
6	river system?	6	generation, especially the recent trend to solar and
7	DR MORRIS: You can design them as a stair step, where the	7	wind resources and the associated role and operation of
8	tailwater of one falls at the powerhouse of the next	8	hydropower with the integration of those resources. My
9	upstream dam. There's no physical limitation to doing	9	purpose here is to provide a general grounding in
10	that.	10	hydropower operation, which will become more relevant to
11	Of course, you have limitations in terms of where	11	you as we proceed through the week. (Pause)
12	you're going to place dams because you have existing	12	In slide 3, I'm going to discuss four main topics.
13	communities. So you have to work around you don't	13	Firstly, an overview of the characteristics of
14	want to flood communities. And if you have a cascade of	14	an integrated power system in general, looking at global
15	dams, you're going to have flooding everywhere along the	15	growth in electricity generation, and then the specifics
16	river. So that's our number one constraint. And it's	16	of the system in India.
	not just the communities on the main stem: you have		
17		17	I'll then discuss some of the general aspects of
18	tributaries. So it's the main stem plus whatever	18	generation expansion planning for a power system, and
19	tributary communities you have.	19	this is to determine how we get to select the plants
20	The second limitation is going upstream. You get to	20	that we actually design for a system.
21	a point higher in the watershed where you have less	21	The use of run-of-river hydroelectric power will be
22	water, you have more risk of GLOF events, landslides,	22	illustrated with respect to the services they provide
23	all types of risks. And this is just characteristic of	23	for the power system and some of the limitations they
24	working in mountains: you get to a certain elevation,	24	have in those systems.
25	and it becomes so difficult that it doesn't make any	25	Then my final section concerns the ongoing evolution
	Page 61		Page 63
	C		
11:10 1	sense. You have access problems, et cetera.	11:43 1	of power systems to integrate the other renewable energy
2	So basically, your limitations are riverside	2	sources. These energy sources are very important and
3	communities in the downstream section; and you reach		
		3	they require significant system supports to enable
4	an area upstream where you just have too much risk, too	3 4	they require significant system supports to enable effective dispatch.
5	an area upstream where you just have too much risk, too much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera.		
		4	effective dispatch.
5	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much.	4 5	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general.
5 6 7	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let	4 5 6 7	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for
5 6 7 8	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation.	4 5 6 7 8	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary
5 6 7 8 9	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful.	4 5 6 7 8 9	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present.
5 6 7 8	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our	4 5 6 7 8	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the
5 6 7 8 9	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for
5 6 7 8 9 10	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am)	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break)	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break)	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So, Mr Rae, whenever you're ready, please proceed.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the 20th century and accelerates significantly from the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So, Mr Rae, whenever you're ready, please proceed. Incorporating a Run-of-River HEP	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the 20th century and accelerates significantly from the 1950s.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So, Mr Rae, whenever you're ready, please proceed. Incorporating a Run-of-River HEP in an Integrated Power System	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the 20th century and accelerates significantly from the 1950s. So going on, looking at electricity demand. It's
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So, Mr Rae, whenever you're ready, please proceed. Incorporating a Run-of-River HEP in an Integrated Power System MR RAE: Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm pleased to	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the 20th century and accelerates significantly from the 1950s. So going on, looking at electricity demand. It's a similar pattern shown in slide 6. And it also shows
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So, Mr Rae, whenever you're ready, please proceed. Incorporating a Run-of-River HEP in an Integrated Power System MR RAE: Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm pleased to be able to speak to you today about this topic. I'm	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the 20th century and accelerates significantly from the 1950s. So going on, looking at electricity demand. It's a similar pattern shown in slide 6. And it also shows the main sources of energy, which you see on the right
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So, Mr Rae, whenever you're ready, please proceed. Incorporating a Run-of-River HEP in an Integrated Power System MR RAE: Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm pleased to be able to speak to you today about this topic. I'm going to present the Court with some background on the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the 20th century and accelerates significantly from the 1950s. So going on, looking at electricity demand. It's a similar pattern shown in slide 6. And it also shows the main sources of energy, which you see on the right side of the slide there.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So, Mr Rae, whenever you're ready, please proceed. Incorporating a Run-of-River HEP in an Integrated Power System MR RAE: Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm pleased to be able to speak to you today about this topic. I'm	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the 20th century and accelerates significantly from the 1950s. So going on, looking at electricity demand. It's a similar pattern shown in slide 6. And it also shows the main sources of energy, which you see on the right
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So, Mr Rae, whenever you're ready, please proceed. Incorporating a Run-of-River HEP in an Integrated Power System MR RAE: Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm pleased to be able to speak to you today about this topic. I'm going to present the Court with some background on the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the 20th century and accelerates significantly from the 1950s. So going on, looking at electricity demand. It's a similar pattern shown in slide 6. And it also shows the main sources of energy, which you see on the right side of the slide there.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	much cost, too many geologic problems, et cetera. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I don't think we have any further questions, so let me just thank you very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. I think we are now at a time where we might take our coffee break. So why don't we return at 11.40. And at that point we will resume, I take it, with Mr Rae. SIR DANIEL: That's correct. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (11.11 am) (A short break) (11.41 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So, Mr Rae, whenever you're ready, please proceed. Incorporating a Run-of-River HEP in an Integrated Power System MR RAE: Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm pleased to be able to speak to you today about this topic. I'm going to present the Court with some background on the operation of run-of-river hydropower projects in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	effective dispatch. (Slide 4) So firstly now, we'll go on to the power system in general. In slide 5, just as a bit of a background for interest's sake, I illustrate the growth in primary energy in demand in the world from 1800 to the present. What you see here is primary energy demand, which is the total energy used before transformation, whether for electricity or waterpower or mills or whatever. This is the total energy consumed. The energy demand globally shows the transition through a series of industrial revolutions, which started in the middle of the 18th century and has continued to the present. The most rapid growth in energy demand starts from the beginning of the 20th century and accelerates significantly from the 1950s. So going on, looking at electricity demand. It's a similar pattern shown in slide 6. And it also shows the main sources of energy, which you see on the right side of the slide there. Electrical energy itself is a relatively recent

20 (Pages 61 to 64)

	development in the arc of human history. The first real	11:47 1	period. This is pointing out that the total generation
	commercial developments of any scale date to the late	2	of course has grown very rapidly; but the majority of
	3 19th and beginning of the 20th century.	3	the growth historically has been in thermal fuels. This
	4 I'd like to appreciate this by considering that my	4	has been coal, largely, in India, but to some degree
	own grandparents were born within a couple of years on	5	other fuels as well.
	6 either side of the turn of the 20th century, so that the	6	An important thing to see in the slides is the
	7 lifetime of global electricity use that we look at now	7	recent growth of renewable energies that have grown
	8 is within the span of three generations. Hopefully 9 I will continue for a while longer!	8	dramatically within the last decade, and the more
	<u> </u>	9	gradual growth of hydro over the period of time illustrated here. The other renewables, shown as the
10	· · · · · ·	10	·
11	2 20	11 12	green line in the figure, are now increasing in the range of 10-15% per year. Again, there is the
13	<u>-</u>	13	Indus Waters Treaty early in that process.
1.		13	Going on to slide 9, I wanted to illustrate the
1:		15	difference between the installed capacity and the energy
10		16	generation by source in India as of 2023. It's
1′		17	important to recall here that there's a very important
18	•	18	difference between installed capacity, or what we refer
19	- I	19	to as "power", and the energy produced using that
20		20	capacity. They are two entirely different things.
2	-	21	Capacity in the system is shown in the figure on the
22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	22	left, and energy is in the figure on the right. So
23	-	23	looking at the capacity first of all, I know the figures
24		24	below are not all that clear. (Pause)
25	other renewable energy sources, which you see as the	25	The thermal fuels is typically in black on the
	Page 65		Page 67
	1 450 03		Tage 07
	orange colour at the top of the slide.	11:49 1	figure, and they account to about 57% of the capacity of
	2 But that said, the core product of the power system	2	the system. Of the thermal fuels, there is largely coal
	has not changed from its earliest development under the	3	and you have some gas, you have some oil and you have
	4 direction of innovators such as Edison, Westinghouse or	4	some diesel use. They're about 57% of that figure on
	5 Tesla. Power systems still operate to provide	5	the left.
	6 electricity at a fixed voltage and frequency. So the	6	When you come to the energy produced in the system,
	7 energy production itself has evolved, but the underlying	7	which is the figure on the right, the thermal fuels then
	 physics of electricity is fundamentally the same. And you'll note here, I've highlighted on the slide 	8 9	make up almost 75% of the energy generated in India. The light blue colour, which is on the lower-right
10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10	side of the left figure, is the amount of generation
1		11	from solar. And the capacity of solar in India now is
12		12	about 30% of the total capacity of the system, which now
13		13	makes up about 12% of the total energy being produced.
14		14	The hydro is the darker blue colour, and it
15		15	comprises about 11% of both the capacity and the energy.
10		16	It's important to understand what's in the system so
17		17	we have a better appreciation for how these plants will
18		18	be operating in that overall system.
19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	19	One of the difficulties with the solar and wind
20	increasing consumption of energy per capita, which is	20	sources is their intermittent nature and the need to
2	what you would expect from an industrialising or	21	provide dedicated energy storage to allow the available
22	developing nation. So you have an energy growth on both	22	energy to be dispatched during the evening hours.
23		23	Again, although the renewables capacity may be 30%; the
24		24	energy is that smaller component. Then issue then is:
25	historical energy generation in India for the same	25	how do we get that energy dispatched in the system?
	Page 66		Page 68

21 (Pages 65 to 68)

11:51 1	So along with the solar capacity, there is dedicated	11:54 1	meeting system demands.
2	energy storage required in these systems: you have to	2	It's also interesting to observe that making
3	have some way of storing the solar that's generated.	3	a transition from isolated to integrated grids has made
4	And that has led to a growth globally in the use of	4	some projects possible where previously there would not
5	batteries. Around the world, the largest amount of	5	have been sufficient demand. An example would be
6	energy storage for solar is with batteries at this	6	a remote watershed where there might have been a project
7	moment.	7	available, but there was no demand locally for it, and
8	India also has plans to implement a large programme	8	that would have constrained the ability to develop that
9	of pump storage development that will provide energy for	9	project. We are now in a world where we have integrated
10	solar implementation. CEA lists 57 GW of pump storage	10	these to such a degree that we're able to develop remote
11	projects, several of which are now in final planning or	11	watersheds. And the Indus Basin comes into
12	construction.	12	consideration in this respect as well.
13	So overall, the Indian system is the third largest	13	Each of the grids that we see regionally here is
14	in the world, and is large relative to the power	14	managed by a system operator, and they determine the
15	stations that we're discussing on the Indus Waters. For	15	daily dispatch of generating plants to meet the demands.
16	example, the Baglihar Hydropower Project, with	16	So they work day by day to determine who's on and who's
17	a capacity of 900 MW, is only 0.2% of the installed	17	off.
18	capacity in India.	18	(Slide 11) So with that general overview, I'd now
19	So a word about system interconnection. And this is	19	like to give some comments or a very brief introduction
20	shown in slide 10, where we show the regional power	20	to how power stations are actually planned.
21	grids in India. There's five interconnected regional	21	In slide 12, I give a diagram here which gives
22	power grids: the northern, northeastern, eastern,	22	a very simplistic description of what goes into
23	southern and western. The figure there shows the	23	a generation expansion planning exercise.
24	general geographic area of those power grids. The	24	The purpose of the planning is to determine the
25	interconnected system allows the power stations to work	25	optimal mix of new power stations that will satisfy
	Page 69		Page 71
11:52 1	in a complementary manner to supply the overall demand.		
		11:56 1	technical and financial constraints. The process
2	But historically, if we go back into the early part	2	includes identification of a power and energy demand
3	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many	2 3	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this
3 4	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single	2 3 4	includes identification of a power and energy demand
3 4 5	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated	2 3 4 5	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own.
3 4 5 6	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world	2 3 4 5 6	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available
3 4 5 6 7	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and	2 3 4 5 6 7	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels,
3 4 5 6 7 8	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large they are here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or I would pay for on our monthly utility bills.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large they are here. Interconnection is important in that it provides	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or I would pay for on our monthly utility bills. The procedures involved in this are typically
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large they are here. Interconnection is important in that it provides system diversity that reinforces the capabilities of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or I would pay for on our monthly utility bills. The procedures involved in this are typically extremely complex, and they seek to represent the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large they are here. Interconnection is important in that it provides system diversity that reinforces the capabilities of the renewable energies and supports the provision of power	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or I would pay for on our monthly utility bills. The procedures involved in this are typically extremely complex, and they seek to represent the capabilities of the system while considering the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large they are here. Interconnection is important in that it provides system diversity that reinforces the capabilities of the renewable energies and supports the provision of power system ancillary benefits. And I'll come to those in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or I would pay for on our monthly utility bills. The procedures involved in this are typically extremely complex, and they seek to represent the capabilities of the system while considering the probabilistic availability of each power station and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large they are here. Interconnection is important in that it provides system diversity that reinforces the capabilities of the renewable energies and supports the provision of power system ancillary benefits. And I'll come to those in a few moments. The interconnections also affect how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or I would pay for on our monthly utility bills. The procedures involved in this are typically extremely complex, and they seek to represent the capabilities of the system while considering the probabilistic availability of each power station and its associated capacity and yield.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large they are here. Interconnection is important in that it provides system diversity that reinforces the capabilities of the renewable energies and supports the provision of power system ancillary benefits. And I'll come to those in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or I would pay for on our monthly utility bills. The procedures involved in this are typically extremely complex, and they seek to represent the capabilities of the system while considering the probabilistic availability of each power station and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large they are here. Interconnection is important in that it provides system diversity that reinforces the capabilities of the renewable energies and supports the provision of power system ancillary benefits. And I'll come to those in a few moments. The interconnections also affect how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or I would pay for on our monthly utility bills. The procedures involved in this are typically extremely complex, and they seek to represent the capabilities of the system while considering the probabilistic availability of each power station and its associated capacity and yield.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But historically, if we go back into the early part of the 20th century, electricity development had many isolated grid systems where a plant would serve a single industrial user or a small utility grid. These isolated grid systems have largely been replaced around the world as power systems and have become more integrated and extended their capability through transmission. So the northern grid region here includes the Indus River basins, the tributaries in Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other basins not covered by the Treaty. This region is fully interconnected with the other regional power grids in India. And as I point out in the pie chart here, the northern region has an installed capacity of about 100,000 MW. So it's not a small system; it's quite large. In proportion to the total each of the grids are a similar size, but you see an idea of how large they are here. Interconnection is important in that it provides system diversity that reinforces the capabilities of the renewable energies and supports the provision of power system ancillary benefits. And I'll come to those in a few moments. The interconnections also affect how hydropower and other energy resources are utilised in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	includes identification of a power and energy demand forecast, what is it we're trying to achieve, and this is generally tied to an economic growth forecast of its own. It's then followed by an assessment of the available resources: what can be produced in terms of fuels, hydropower, solar or whatever. They all go into a basket to be identified. We then go through a process of selecting the technologies, and balancing the supply and demand so that we add enough power stations to meet the demand that's arriving from the forecast. This then goes to the next step of, with the available projects, analysing the production costs of actually producing the power and energy from that system, which ultimately leads to an appreciation of what would be the tariff for end-users: what you or I would pay for on our monthly utility bills. The procedures involved in this are typically extremely complex, and they seek to represent the capabilities of the system while considering the probabilistic availability of each power station and its associated capacity and yield. To grossly simplify the process it's what

11:57	1	I've put on the right-hand side of the side we define	12:00 1	It's important to note here that the terms I use
	2	options, we estimate the demand, we develop a plan for	2	reflect a normal power planning application.
	3	new plants and we estimate what is the cost of energy	3	Critically, the Indus Waters Treaty adopts a specific
	4	from that plan. And then we go through an economic	4	formula that simplifies this computation of the firm
	5	evaluation process to make sure that we have an optimum	5	power by establishing the flow rate that will be used to
	6	plan that is affordable within the tariff expectations.	6	calculate the firm power. This simplification allows
	7	The key step for my purposes today is that step on	7	for the definition of firm power without resorting to
	8	the selection of the generation expansion; that is, what	8	a generation planning analysis or any other assumptions.
	9	is the least cost combination of plants with firm power	9	So effectively it has removed this process from being
	10	and firm energy capacity to just meet the demand	10	under the remit of the Treaty.
	11	forecast. Stated another way, what is the capital	11	So Dr Miles will address you on the meaning and
	12	investment plan for the power stations that will meet	12	application of the terms "Firm Power" and the associated
	13	our demand forecast?	13	term for "Pondage" as they are used in the Treaty, and
	14	Open power markets in many countries have changed	14	you'll be able to follow up with him, I believe,
	15	some aspects of how planning is done, with a transition from direct utility investment in favour of market	15	tomorrow.
	16	•	16 17	The energy though is the accumulated amount of power over a time period. It's the same as what appears in
	17 18	structuring and policy to encourage independent power producers. But the underlying requirement to have	18	your household utility bills as the monthly consumption
	19	sufficient demand to meet forecast still exists. So all	19	in kilowatt hours. Hydropower energy is computed at the
	20	markets, public or private, must provide firm power and	20	power system level as the outcome of what can be
	21	firm energy to supply the peak demands in the power	21	produced with the available hydrology and the power
	22	system.	22	capability of the power stations.
	23	The planning process I have just summarised is	23	Firm energy is that amount that will have an assured
	24	performed very early in the development process for	24	availability from the power station for delivery to the
	25	power stations. It is generally when the underlying	25	customers. And typically, firm energy is found as the
	20		25	customers. That typicarry, firm energy is round as the
		Page 73		Page 75
11:58	1	studies are at a pre-feasibility or feasibility level,	12:02 1	combination to the overall power system when a power
11.50	2	so they are identified and there's a preliminary layout	2	station is added. It is computed for a critical
	3	and a preliminary costing available for them. The	3	low-flow period in the case of hydropower. It's not
	4	process then proceeds after the generation plan is	4	an average, it's actually a low-flow condition, so it
	5	confirmed and additional studies are performed to define	5	has assured reliability in all cases. To be considered
	6	the project in preparation for its design. This can be	6	firm, it must be available for the planning period with
	7	a period of many years between when it might be	7	the selected reliability.
	8	identified in the planning to when it ultimately becomes	8	Firm power also must be assured available, but it's
	9	available for design.	9	the capacity of the individual power stations and it's
	10	So turning to slide 13. I've been referring to the	10	merely the rate at which energy is produced. It does
	11	terms "firm power" and "firm energy", and it's very	11	not show the total amount of energy; it's only the rate
	12	important to recognise the differentiation between the	12	of production of energy.
	13	two. But they're key inputs to the generation expansion	13	People dealing with power planning and hydropower,
	14	planning process. In essence, they determine how much	14	we're quite protective of the terms "power" and "energy"
	15	of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any	15	as different items, in much the same way that there's
	16	given power station, which then establishes when plants	16	a difference between cement and concrete. I would
	17	must be added to meet those demands. So the firm power	17	recall that in my first year of engineering, I took
	18	and firm energy is the input to the generation expansion	18	a course on concrete methods, and was told: if you refer
	19	plan, or when we're going to add plants into the system.	19	to it as "cement", you fail. And the same thing comes
	20	The firm power and firm energy define the	20	with power and energy: they are different things and we
	21	capabilities of the individual power stations as it's	21	deal with them differently.
	22	added to the power system. So at each step, the firm	22	The firm power that can be produced by a hydropower
	23	power is the firm power of the total system, and the	23	station can be larger than the power generated with the
	24	firm energy is the firm energy of the total system with	24 25	flow rate available on a given day, and that's because
	25	that plant added.	25	pondage can be available so that the plant can be
		Page 74		Page 76

12:03			
12.03	1 scheduled for less than 24 hours in a day. We take the	12:06 1	going again?
	2 volume of water, which is analogous to the volume of	2	So the rows going down the left-hand side show the
	3 energy, and we can then reschedule that into a shorter	3	contribution from the different available generation
	4 period of time so we can use a greater degree of power.	4	resources, and the one at the top is hydropower. You
	5 The daily peaks for that peaking operation can be	5	can see, going across the diagram, it has blue dots for
	6 a few hours during an evening period, but can be quite	6	almost everything, which means it is a very valuable
	short. But generally in the order of four to	7	producer of ancillary services.
	8 eight hours in a typical day.	8	The ones closer to the bottom are solar, wind and
	9 It's important that if you're doing a peaking	9	battery storage. Solar and wind particularly, being the
1	operation like this, there is a period of the day when	10	bottom two, have very few of the blue dots. So they
1	the plant does not operate. And during that period of	11	don't have such great contributions to the ancillary
1	the day you'll accumulate the water in the pondage so	12	services.
1	that you can release it at the higher rate at a later	13	The other ones in the middle, the thermal plants,
1	time of day.	14	whether oil or natural gas or steam or nuclear, all have
1	So firm power is the amount available in megawatts	15	some contribution to ancillary services.
1	that's available for dispatch by the power station at	16	At one time, most generating facilities could
1	any time, and the amount of energy to be generated with	17	contribute to these ancillary services. But as we add
1	that firm power determines the number of hours that the	18	more solar and wind resources, utility planners must now
1	19 plant can operate. A traditional method of planning	19	make dedicated provisions for the ancillary services,
2	uses load duration analyses to show how firm power and	20	which are defined either as direct investments or by
2	21 energy from plants can be combined to stack in the	21	incentivising investment by private investors through
2	overall load, and I'll show you an illustration of that	22	policy.
2	in a moment.	23	The hydropower is a valuable source of the ancillary
2	So an important thing, going forward, that is:	24	services, as indicated in the slide, but its value does
2	in addition to power and energy production, power	25	depend on whether the hydro is run-of-river or storage,
	Page 77		Page 79
	1 age //		Tage 17
		1	
12:05	1 systems as a whole must have characteristics such as	12:08 1	or even pumped storage.
	what are listed in slide 14 here, which ensure the	2	(Slide 15) Let's look at some of the details of how
	quality of supply. And this slide is reproduced from	3	hydropower itself is operating.
	4 a report by the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland grid	4	
	a report by the remissivaling rick sersey waryland grid	4	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion
	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's	5	
	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion
	5 system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's	5	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at
	 system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services 	5 6	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier.
	 system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. 	5 6 7	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for
	 system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard 	5 6 7 8	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the
1	 system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get 	5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers.
1 1 1	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and
1 1 1 1	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical
1 1 1 1	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine,
1 1 1 1 1	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems.
1 1 1 1 1 1	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to start up and deal with a load over a period of anywhere	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the generator.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to start up and deal with a load over a period of anywhere from minutes to hours.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the generator. The generator itself must spin at a constant speed
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to start up and deal with a load over a period of anywhere from minutes to hours. Other columns in the diagram are: how quickly	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the generator. The generator itself must spin at a constant speed to create a constant electrical frequency. The
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to start up and deal with a load over a period of anywhere from minutes to hours. Other columns in the diagram are: how quickly a plant can start up; whether it has storage available	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the generator. The generator itself must spin at a constant speed to create a constant electrical frequency. The frequency is determined from the rotational speed of the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to start up and deal with a load over a period of anywhere from minutes to hours. Other columns in the diagram are: how quickly a plant can start up; whether it has storage available for its fuel; and its ability to enable the power system	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the generator. The generator itself must spin at a constant speed to create a constant electrical frequency. The frequency is determined from the rotational speed of the generator and the design of the rotor and the stator,
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to start up and deal with a load over a period of anywhere from minutes to hours. Other columns in the diagram are: how quickly a plant can start up; whether it has storage available for its fuel; and its ability to enable the power system to start from a black start situation: for example,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the generator. The generator itself must spin at a constant speed to create a constant electrical frequency. The frequency is determined from the rotational speed of the generator and the design of the rotor and the stator, which are the spinning and stationary part of the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to start up and deal with a load over a period of anywhere from minutes to hours. Other columns in the diagram are: how quickly a plant can start up; whether it has storage available for its fuel; and its ability to enable the power system	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the generator. The generator itself must spin at a constant speed to create a constant electrical frequency. The frequency is determined from the rotational speed of the generator and the design of the rotor and the stator,
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to start up and deal with a load over a period of anywhere from minutes to hours. Other columns in the diagram are: how quickly a plant can start up; whether it has storage available for its fuel; and its ability to enable the power system to start from a black start situation: for example,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the generator. The generator itself must spin at a constant speed to create a constant electrical frequency. The frequency is determined from the rotational speed of the generator and the design of the rotor and the stator, which are the spinning and stationary part of the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	system in the United States (P-603), and I find it's a useful diagram to illustrate typical power services common to all power systems. The columns in the chart and they're a bit hard to read here, but in a sense it's not essential we get every minor detail. The columns in the chart shows various services often referred to as "ancillary" or "secondary" benefits. These services include factors such as the ability to regulate voltage and the ability to regulate frequency; the ability to follow a varying load in the power system; and what is called "spinning reserve", which is the reserve available in the power system able to react quickly to changes in the load; and standby reserves, which is the ability of the plant to start up and deal with a load over a period of anywhere from minutes to hours. Other columns in the diagram are: how quickly a plant can start up; whether it has storage available for its fuel; and its ability to enable the power system to start from a black start situation: for example, after a power outage, can you bring it up and get it	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Slide 16) Electricity is created by the conversion of the potential energy of water to mechanical energy at the turbine, I think as was described to you earlier. The electrical energy at the generator is provided for transmission to the power grid for distribution to the customers. Potential energy of the water is simply the difference in head between the reservoir upstream and the tailwater downstream and the density of water, and gravity. That's the potential energy. The electrical energy is a function of the efficiencies of the turbine, generator, transformer and other electrical systems. And that electrical energy comes about as we convert the potential energy of the water through the turbine to kinetic energy, and then to electrical energy in the generator. The generator itself must spin at a constant speed to create a constant electrical frequency. The frequency is determined from the rotational speed of the generator and the design of the rotor and the stator, which are the spinning and stationary part of the generator itself. And the turbine is directly coupled

12:09 1	to the generator so it also spins at a constant speed,	12:12 1	units were operating at part-load, and were available to
2	even with changes in flow rate.	2	the power system to have the load adjust up or down, as
3	The output from the hydropower plant is the power,	3	needed to contribute to correction of the frequency of
4	which varies with the flow rate and the generating head.	4	the power system. So they were working for ancillary
5	And it's simply, again, the rate at which the energy can	5	benefits generation during that period of time.
6	be delivered for a given flow rate, and it's independent	6	So we sometimes think that hydropower plants only
7	of the hydrology.	7	provide a block-loading of power and energy for peaking.
8	The other primary output is the energy, which is,	8	That's part of the role; and it's important, of course,
9	again, different from power. The energy is a function	9	but the availability of the ancillary services is
10	of the flow rate available in the river and the power	10	actually also an important function of hydroelectric
11	capacity of the plant. The energy is computed by	11	plants. The provision of some ancillary services will
12 13	aggregating the power produced in each second of the day for the whole period of time that the plant operates.	12 13	generally require that a hydropower plant is operated at a partial load, subject to governor control.
13 14	As such, it's simply a sum of power over time. Energy	13 14	a partial load, subject to governor control. What I've shown on slide 18, on the right-hand side,
15	then will be expressed in kilowatt hours or gigawatt	15	is a typical efficiency diagram for a Francis turbine.
16	hours, whichever; whereas power is expressed in	16	On the bottom is the flow rate; and the other side, the
17	kilowatts, megawatts or gigawatts.	17	vertical axis, is efficiency. And typically, we want
18	A very, very simplistic view here, which is	18	the plant to operate between about 60% and 100% of the
19	important for how the plant operates this is in	19	rated flow. Ideally, it would operate around 80%, where
20	slide 17 that all power stations are controlled by	20	it's close to the peak efficiency.
21	a governor, whether hydropower or thermal power, even.	21	So if the plant is available for ancillary services
22	The governor functions to maintain a constant frequency	22	function, it's able to operate at the peak of the
23	in the power system or to control key requirements such	23	efficiency curve, and allow the governor to operate to
24	as flow rate and water level. The governor has	24	vary the load a little bit up or down from that, as it's
25	different operating modes, depending on the plant	25	needed to provide whatever services, whether frequency
	Page 81		Page 83
12:10 1	characteristics and the power system.	10.14.1	
		12:14 1	control or spinning reserve, or to follow the load
2	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you	2	changes in the power system.
3	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the	2 3	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will
3 4	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of	2 3 4	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the
3 4 5	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand	2 3 4 5	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less
3 4 5 6	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor	2 3 4 5 6	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services.
3 4 5 6 7	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system.	2 3 4 5 6 7	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve.
3 4 5 6 7 8	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power output. The governor systems available today then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the flow rate, whatever is set as the requirement. The
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power output. The governor systems available today then monitor the speed, and react to the power system to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the flow rate, whatever is set as the requirement. The operating turbine can ramp the load up or down rapidly,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power output. The governor systems available today then monitor the speed, and react to the power system to adjust the power plant to maintain the set point	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the flow rate, whatever is set as the requirement. The operating turbine can ramp the load up or down rapidly, if it's already operating. This is frequently required
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power output. The governor systems available today then monitor the speed, and react to the power system to adjust the power plant to maintain the set point positions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the flow rate, whatever is set as the requirement. The operating turbine can ramp the load up or down rapidly,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power output. The governor systems available today then monitor the speed, and react to the power system to adjust the power plant to maintain the set point positions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the flow rate, whatever is set as the requirement. The operating turbine can ramp the load up or down rapidly, if it's already operating. This is frequently required for systems that include solar generation. I'll
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power output. The governor systems available today then monitor the speed, and react to the power system to adjust the power plant to maintain the set point positions. So during our visit to the Neelum-Jhelum control room, if you recall, the operator said that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the flow rate, whatever is set as the requirement. The operating turbine can ramp the load up or down rapidly, if it's already operating. This is frequently required for systems that include solar generation. I'll demonstrate to you in a moment here how variable solar
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power output. The governor systems available today then monitor the speed, and react to the power system to adjust the power plant to maintain the set point positions. So during our visit to the Neelum-Jhelum control room, if you recall, the operator said that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the flow rate, whatever is set as the requirement. The operating turbine can ramp the load up or down rapidly, if it's already operating. This is frequently required for systems that include solar generation. I'll demonstrate to you in a moment here how variable solar can be, and why it's important to have systems like
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power output. The governor systems available today then monitor the speed, and react to the power system to adjust the power plant to maintain the set point positions. So during our visit to the Neelum-Jhelum control room, if you recall, the operator said that the generator was operating for frequency control on that day. What he means by that is that turbine generator	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the flow rate, whatever is set as the requirement. The operating turbine can ramp the load up or down rapidly, if it's already operating. This is frequently required for systems that include solar generation. I'll demonstrate to you in a moment here how variable solar can be, and why it's important to have systems like hydro that can provide some of this contribution. So why do I say all this? Well, pondage is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is one of the large sets of equipment that you will have seen on the turbine floor level during the Neelum-Jhelum visit. It will have been large tanks of oil and other gear that were pretty hard to understand what they were. But this is part of the governor system. In very simplified terms, there's a sensor which continuously monitors the rotating speed of the turbine and the position of its wicket gates. If the speed falls below a set point, then the governor injects oil in the system, which causes the wicket gates to open and the speed of the turbine to increase to match the set point. And similarly, it goes the other direction and reduces the flow if it's going down. But the governor also has set points available to be able to control water level, flow rate or even power output. The governor systems available today then monitor the speed, and react to the power system to adjust the power plant to maintain the set point positions. So during our visit to the Neelum-Jhelum control room, if you recall, the operator said that the generator was operating for frequency control on that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	changes in the power system. But the contribution of run-of-river hydropower will vary seasonally. And a plant on full load during the wet season produces more energy, but it contributes less to what I call the ancillary services. At part-load, the plant has some spinning reserve. And spinning reserve again is: every time you go in a room and you flip on a light switch, you increase the power demand in the power system, and some power station somewhere in the system must react in order to pick up all those thousands of people flipping on light switches. And that's what spinning reserve does: it allows the plant to operate automatically to make that adjustment. The governor will vary the turbine flow to follow the frequency, to control water levels or to control the flow rate, whatever is set as the requirement. The operating turbine can ramp the load up or down rapidly, if it's already operating. This is frequently required for systems that include solar generation. I'll demonstrate to you in a moment here how variable solar can be, and why it's important to have systems like hydro that can provide some of this contribution.

25 (Pages 81 to 84)

12:15	1	necessary in hydropower projects to provide the energy	12:19 1	an illustration of the effect of the curves day by day
	2	storage needed to allow for these variations in the	2	or season by season. And what we see here is that there
	3	turbine discharge when it does not match precisely with	3	is not a single load curve that is characteristic for
	4	the inflow. So you may have all of these things	4	the power system, where each day is reproduced
	5	happening in the power system, and that creates minor	5	identically. They are different: every day, every
	6	change or small changes in the power plant, and we then	6	month, and from year to year. This is four that were
	7	need the pondage to buffer those. It provides a volume	7	presented for 2014 and 2015 in the available reference.
	8	available for surplus or deficit storage within the	8	It shows again that there's a very significant
	9	system.	9	baseload, but it also shows some significant difference
	10	So in this sense, the pondage is reacting to the	10	between years, which I don't fully understand, to be
	11	loads of the system by adjusting the loads of the plant.	11	honest, but this is what was provided in the reference
	12	I differentiate loads of the system from loads of the	12	document. The difference is very significant between
	13	plant: they're again different, because any one plant	13	the seasons, and this is four typical seasons of the
	14	doesn't deal with the entire system; they're no longer	14	year.
	15	isolated, they're all integrated. So pondage is our	15	So all plants in the power system will operate to
	16	buffer to provide that ability to deliver these	16	some degree to supply this hourly demand variation, and
	17	ancillary services to a power system. Pondage is also	17	this is especially true of storage hydropower projects
	18	used for the daily peaking if the plant is scheduled for	18	that have flexibility to schedule the timing of their
	19	only certain hours in the day.	19	generation. Gas turbine and diesel plants adjust load
	20	So if we come down to the level of the power system,	20	very quickly and they will tend to fill the upper part
	21	what I've put on the slide here in slide 19 is a typical	21	of the peaks in these diagrams. And even coal-fired
	22	daily load curve for the "all India" case in India.	22	plants will fill part of it, and that would be typically
	23	These are produced by an agency in India which makes	23	from the nighttime through part of the daytime.
	24	some information available. But it shows, minute by	24	Run-of-river hydropower projects can vary their load
	25	minute, the power that must be delivered into the	25	subject to the pondage available and the flow available
		Page 85		Page 87
		Tage 03		I ugo o,
12:17	1	system. And if you take the area under the curve, that	12:20 1	in the river. Peaking using pondage, though, is only
	2	would be the energy; whereas the left axis is the power;	2	available during the part of the year when the flow rate
	3	and of course the bottom is the time. So if you take	3	is less than required to generate at the installed
	4	the area, you're taking the power in megawatts times the	4	capacity.
	5	time, giving you megawatt hours, which is the area under	5	If you are into the wet season of the year and these
	6	the curve or the energy.	6	plants are full-loaded, they are supplying the load at
	7	And note also that this is only the upper part of	7	the bottom of these diagrams, where it's continuous
	8	the curve. The left axis would actually show that about	8	through the day. In the dry season, there is some
	9	100 GW below the bottom of this curve is baseload: it's	9	variation through the day, and it's a matter of making
	10	there all the time. And it's only the variability on	10	that continuous enough to fill those long periods of the
	11	the top, which is about from 80% to 120% of the average.	11	higher loads, which are typically in the order of six to
	12	So in practice, the system operator, or the dispatch	12	eight hours.
	13	operator, has to select a pattern of power stations to	13	But it's important to recognise that pondage is not
	14	enter the system on a daily basis to respond to this	14	the only factor that determines the peak-period energy
	15	sort of load variation. The operator must always	15	provided from a run-of-river plant. The energy
	16	schedule plants that are going to deliver whatever	16	available is ultimately limited by the stream flow on
	17	required ancillary benefits. Whether the spinning	17	any day.
	18	reserve or standby reserve or frequency control or	18	(Slide 21) So what we do with these is actually,
	19	whatnot, they also have to be scheduled. So they	19	from a generation planning perspective, we want to
	20	actually have a big job, if we're looking at a system of	20	simplify this, because those are very difficult to deal
	21	about 100 GW and we're scheduling plants of 100 MW,	21	with if you're doing generation planning analysis. So
	22	those plants start to look pretty small. So you have to	22	we've simplified them here by reorganising them into
	23	imagine the operator, doing this every day, has to have	23	load duration curves. And all this is showing is
		1 4 4	24	a managerta an of times are arrived and marrian another ather
	24	some shortcuts.		a percentage of time on one axis and power on the other
	24 25	(Slide 20) But before we get there, this comes to	25	axis. And again, if you were to integrate the area
		(Slide 20) But before we get there, this comes to		axis. And again, if you were to integrate the area

12:22	1	underneath these curves, you would come up with energy.	12:25 1	complementary facilities in the power system, both from
	2	So again, the two remain different.	2	various electrical devices at the distribution level but
	3	All our generation planning process does is try to	3	also at the generation level. A key issue is the
	4	determine how we could what we call "stack" the projects	4	variability of the generation and the need for energy
	5	in there, so that each one has a slice horizontally	5	storage, which must be provided after the transformation
	6	where the area of the slice is equal to the energy	6	to electricity.
	7	available and the depth of the slice is equal to the	7	With our traditional generation resources, energy
	8	power available. So if we have a firm power available	8	storage was easily available. It was done before we
	9	for a plant, we then take the amount of energy we have,	9	generated electricity: we had heaps of coal at power
1	10	and we find a place in that diagram where the two fit	10	stations, or we had liquid fuels, or we had nuclear fuel
1	1	and match it optimally.	11	bundles, or we had natural gas reserves. All of these
1	12	When we actually do it for generation planning,	12	were energy stored before transformation.
1	13	it gets a whole lot more complicated, but I don't think	13	Hydropower plants storage hydropower,
1	14	we need to get into the details for that.	14	reservoirs can provide seasonal energy storage, but
1	15	(Slide 22) So that brings me to operation with other	15	run-of-river doesn't offer much in the way of energy
1	16	renewable sources.	16	storage because the energy is available on a day-by-day
1	17	What is often referred to as "other renewables" is	17	basis. It has some very short-term storage that we can
1	18	now the fastest growing source of power generation in	18	talk about.
1	19	almost every part of the world. "Other renewable	19	Pumped storage and I've referred to this a little
2	20	energy" generally refers to solar and wind as the main	20	bit today or batteries can be used to provide
2	21	contributors, but the classification can also include	21	dedicated energy storage not limited by hydrology, and
2	22	biomass, geothermal, ocean energy and a host of other	22	can be configured to maximise financial returns
2	23	systems that are available. The largest, though, of	23	available from the marketing of energy.
	24	these is solar and wind. The addition of the other	24	(Slide 24) So just to give a bit of a background on
2	25	renewable energy to an integrated system affects how the	25	these sources. What I show in this diagram and this
		Page 89		Page 91
	1	other generation works, especially hydropower.	12:26 1	is taken from the organisation IRENA, which shows the
	2	So when we look at the area here, as illustrated in	2	evolution in costs for renewable energy sources.
	3	slide 23, India, and even more so Pakistan, is well	3	I don't know if it's very clear, but in each column, or
	4	situated for solar generation. I am speaking	4	in each section, you have bioenergy, geothermal,
	5	predominantly about solar in the coming remarks,	5	hydropower, solar photovoltaic, which is most of what we
	6	although it's to some degree also related to wind. Both countries are well situated for generation of solar,	6	get from solar, onshore and offshore wind, and what's
	7	which can be obtained from utility-scale plants, plants	7	called concentrating solar power.
	8	in the order of hundreds of megawatts, as well as from	8	It's interesting to look at each of these. I'll focus mainly on the solar and wind. It shows levelised
	9 10	farm- or household-scale plants.	9 10	cost of energy, which is a way of computing a value of
	11	Solar and wind energy can be expected to exceed	11	energy which determines its capacity cost and all
	12	hydropower generation in coming years, as new solar and	12	lifecycle costs involved in the generation of energy
	13	wind generation will outpace the possible additions to	13	from that source, and it allows us to compare projects
	14	the hydropower sector. As an example, there's recent	14	on a common basis.
	15	press reports in India of a solar park to produce 30 GW	15	The values here are world weighted averages. So
	16	of power that's planned for the state of Gujarat.	16	there can be locally different conditions, but the
	17	That's 30,000 MW in one solar park.	17	trends over the time periods are clear.
	18	An important advantage of these resources is that	18	We can see in the yellow in the middle of the
	19	solar especially can be located closer to the demand,	19	figure I hope it's coming through as yellow for
	20	allowing for some reduction in transmission losses.	20	you that the cost of solar has declined dramatically
	21	However, the other renewable resources do require	21	over the ten-year period that was given here, and now
			22	we're producing solar at about 4.9 cents per kilowatt
		improvements in the transmission grid generally, but the		we're producing solar at about 4.7 cents per knowatt
2	22	improvements in the transmission grid generally, but the connectivity, at the same time, improves the reliability		
2 2		connectivity, at the same time, improves the reliability	23 24	hour. One over, at the onshore wind, it's producing
2 2 2	22 23		23	
2 2 2	22 23 24	connectivity, at the same time, improves the reliability and consistency of solar and wind. Both projects have characteristics that require	23 24	hour. One over, at the onshore wind, it's producing energy at a cost of about 3.3 cents per kilowatt hour. Hydropower is the other key source in there. It has
2 2 2	22 23 24	connectivity, at the same time, improves the reliability and consistency of solar and wind.	23 24	hour. One over, at the onshore wind, it's producing energy at a cost of about 3.3 cents per kilowatt hour.

27 (Pages 89 to 92)

Day 3 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase

12:28 1 12:31 1 a typical value of around 6, or just over 6 cents per But a key thing is the variability within the day 2 kilowatt hour. But note that the cost of the solar and for solar, and the biggest limitation is that it doesn't 3 3 wind especially are declining with time, whereas have anything, of course, in the nighttime hours. So we 4 hydropower continues to increase, because it's more 4 need other generation sources to complement the solar, 5 5 affected by the general economic development, and it's and a key requirement is fast-reacting power. 6 a mature technology, so it doesn't have technological 6 But one of the limitations we have is that even with 7 7 improvements that would tend to bring down costs. those spikes up and down that you see on that figure, 8 The hydropower costs will vary depending on whether 8 they're faster than what a typical hydro turbine can 9 9 the plant is configured with a storage reservoir or as react to. The hydro turbine will have a certain amount 10 10 run-of-river. But generally, a storage reservoir of inertia, but its ability to change its load to follow 11 hydropower would allow for much greater capture of the 11 these spikes, that ability is not there. It can change 12 available energy, while increasing the benefits to the 12 in minutes, not seconds. So there is a need for 13 power system for firm energy and firm power. So we 13 short-term storage using batteries to buffer some of 14 14 might see a greater value in one of those projects. 15 15 (Slide 25) For comparison -- if you just remember So to the extent that there is extended periods 16 16 those numbers: 3.3, 4.9 and 6 -- if we look at thermal during the day when the power shuts off, that's when the 17 17 power plants, which is from the same reference and is spinning reserve and the hydropower can react and fill 18 showing the cost of thermal power plants from 18 in those periods. But the nighttime storage is needed 19 combined-cycle gas turbines, which is actually the most 19 for the transfer of surplus from the daytime to the 20 20 common thermal plant in the United States right now, nighttime. 21 coal, which is the steam plant using coal as a fuel, 21 When it comes to run-of-river hydropower, it's 22 which is declining in many areas but still prevalent 22 important to realise that run-of-river hydro does not 23 here, open-cycle gas turbine and oil-fired plant. The 23 actually store energy. What we're able to do in 24 best cost of these is about 5.8 cents. 24 a run-of-river is only defer the energy available in 25 25 The big uprise to the right of these diagrams just one part of the day to the latter part of the day, or Page 93 Page 95 12:33 1 12:30 1 shows the sensitivity to the price of fuels. We've had, into the peaking period or nighttime period. It's 2 2 of course, some important upheavals in the latter years, an energy deferral, it's not an energy storage. For me, 3 because of Covid and geopolitical interruptions around 3 an energy storage is if I take part of that surplus 4 4 available in the daytime and I can store it and draw the world. 5 5 But the floor value for the LCOE for thermal plants from it later. Run-of-river doesn't do that. 6 6 The energy storage available or the energy deferral is about 5.8 cents, based on this information. Note 7 7 these are just the costs for the supply of energy. The available for run-of-river can be unreliable because it 8 8 end-user cost is higher, once the additional system depends on the watershed hydrology, so what is the flow 9 9 costs for transmission, distribution, energy storage rate of that day. And that tells me how much energy 10 10 and, importantly, ancillary services are included in the I can actually get in the peak period, if I'm able to do 11 analysis. 11 some moderate peaking. 12 12 So, having said now that we can produce solar at So the system still requires something to do that. 13 13 a lower cost than thermal, or likely even lower than And that's where we come into the development of storage 14 14 hydro, why isn't it the only new generation being hydropower, which is specifically developed to provide 15 15 provided? Slide 26 illustrates part of the problem. dedicated storage for these systems; or the use of battery storage, which both deals with the short-term 16 16 On a good day, on the left-hand side, the generation 17 17 buffering of the very abrupt changes, but also for tracks the solar radiation through the daylight hours, 18 18 even though there are still some minor fluctuations. utility-scale uses for the daily energy storage. 19 19 (Slide 27) If I go off my rooftop, this is what you However, on a poor day, the solar production varies 20 20 get in the state of California. I picked a typical day: significantly, with frequent large swings in output. 21 21 this is June 5, 2024, just for information's sake. It This is the bits jumping up and down very rapidly. 22. 22 These figures come from a small solar installation on shows how the other renewable energy sources are 23 the roof of my house in southern Canada, so I can pick 23 integrated in a large power system. 24 24 any day you'd like and I can come up with similar The gold colour is solar. That's what's produced on 25 diagrams. 25 a typical day in California where we are today. And the Page 94 Page 96

28 (Pages 93 to 96)

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Day 3 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase Wednesday, 10Wednesday, 10 July 2024

12:34 1 problem for the system operator is: how do I react to 2 that? How do I fit that in and fill the evening? 3 Another thing to notice in here is the hydro line, 4 which is the pale blue near the bottom. That draws from 5 a whole series of hydropower energy resources within the 6 state of California, but it has a very moderate peak 7 between the day and the evening. This is largely due to 8 a variety of hydrological, technical or environmental 12:38 1 So the hydropower in that case provides the 2 ancillary benefits to support the solar, especial 3 respect to the inertia, the spinning reserve and 4 load following. The inertia has to do with mak 5 that you don't have very abrupt changes in the 6 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 7 interruptions don't create a large disruption at the 8 customer level.	ith
that? How do I fit that in and fill the evening? Another thing to notice in here is the hydro line, which is the pale blue near the bottom. That draws from a whole series of hydropower energy resources within the state of California, but it has a very moderate peak between the day and the evening. This is largely due to 2 ancillary benefits to support the solar, especial 3 respect to the inertia, the spinning reserve and load following. The inertia has to do with mak 5 that you don't have very abrupt changes in the You want enough of what's called "inertia" so interruptions don't create a large disruption at the	
Another thing to notice in here is the hydro line, which is the pale blue near the bottom. That draws from a whole series of hydropower energy resources within the state of California, but it has a very moderate peak between the day and the evening. This is largely due to respect to the inertia, the spinning reserve and load following. The inertia has to do with mak that you don't have very abrupt changes in the You want enough of what's called "inertia" so interruptions don't create a large disruption at the	y with
which is the pale blue near the bottom. That draws from a whole series of hydropower energy resources within the state of California, but it has a very moderate peak between the day and the evening. This is largely due to 4 load following. The inertia has to do with mak 5 that you don't have very abrupt changes in the 6 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 7 interruptions don't create a large disruption at the following of the inertia has to do with mak 5 that you don't have very abrupt changes in the 6 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 7 interruptions don't create a large disruption at the following of the inertia has to do with mak 5 that you don't have very abrupt changes in the 6 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 7 interruptions don't create a large disruption at the following of the inertia has to do with mak 5 that you don't have very abrupt changes in the 6 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 8 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 9 You want enough of what you want	•
5 a whole series of hydropower energy resources within the 6 state of California, but it has a very moderate peak 7 between the day and the evening. This is largely due to 5 that you don't have very abrupt changes in the 6 You want enough of what's called "inertia" so 7 interruptions don't create a large disruption at t	
state of California, but it has a very moderate peak You want enough of what's called "inertia" so between the day and the evening. This is largely due to This is largely due to	-
7 between the day and the evening. This is largely due to 7 interruptions don't create a large disruption at t	-
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
o a variety of flydrological, technical of chyfrolinellial 6 custoffiel fevel.	
9 constraints that constrain how these projects can be 9 However, these sorts of benefits spinning	
10 used abruptly. 10 reserve, load falling, inertia they're only available.	lable
11 Most of the contribution to the evening peak, over 11 if the hydropower station is actually running di	
there, is provided by the fact that on this particular 12 period when solar energy is being produced. T	-
day, it wasn't very windy during the day, but then the 13 transfer for peaking is also possible, but the	
14 wind picked up in the evening, so there was some 14 run-of-river hydropower is of course limited in	this
15 generation from there. 15 because of the amount of energy available for or	
But the largest part, a discretionary availability 16 Another difficulty is that the ability of	
to the power utility, is natural gas sources, which is 17 run-of-river hydro to transfer energy during the	wet
the darker blue across the bottom, and the use of 18 season is effectively zero. So it doesn't have so	
19 batteries, which is in the pale green colour. 19 energy storage in wet season because the water	
20 California is a state that has recently developed 20 available to run as baseload. What that means	
21 over 10,000 MW of battery capacity dealing with this 21 the poor utility planner has to provide enough	
22 evening storage problem. Note that it's hard to see 22 capability in the system so that they can provide	e that
in the figure, but the battery actually gets used almost 23 energy storage and energy transfer during the v	
24 through the entire day, because it's also dealing with 24 year.	
25 that short-term variability of the solar as it comes on 25 If you've provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season, because of the solar as it comes of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season of the solar as it comes of the solar as it comes on 25 are provided it for the wet season of the solar as it comes of	ause
Page 97 Page 99	
1 age 97	
12:36 1 and off: clouds pass by and whatnot. 12:39 1 your poor run-of-river hydropower project can	_
2 A similar picture to this occurs in any area of the 2 it then, so you've provided it anyways. To the	
world with large solar power inputs to the system. The 3 that you get some capability in the dry season,	well,
4 system must have energy storage available to shift some 4 I've already got that capability in these other	
5 of that deviting symplys into examing hours and it must 5 facilities so I coult count that as a banefit of the	
5 of that daytime surplus into evening hours and it must 5 facilities, so I can't count that as a benefit of that	
6 also be able to contend with, in the case of 6 run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer.	
6 also be able to contend with, in the case of 6 run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. 7 run-of-river, the available hydrology. 7 So solar generation is important, but it doesn	't
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to 6 run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. 7 So solar generation is important, but it doesn 8 really fundamentally change how we're going to	't o use our
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That fun-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in	't o use our the
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That filters some of the local variability with the solar and or run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer.	't o use our the te
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That filters some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection are run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera to baseload energy. They have some capability for	't o use our the te or peaking
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That filters some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer.	the teepre peaking the
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera in the dry season, at least to some degree, with see that in this diagram as the imports, which are	the ouse our the te peaking the blace
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That filters some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we see that in this diagram as the imports, which are run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera power system because of their ability to genera in the dry season, at least to some degree, with energy available. But they don't completely representation are going to the dedicated energy storages that are going to	the ouse our the te peaking the blace
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That filters some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we see that in this diagram as the imports, which are regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. That pun-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera to baseload energy. They have some capability for in the dry season, at least to some degree, with energy available. But they don't completely reposite the other dedicated energy storages that are going to the run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. That power system because of their ability to genera to baseload energy. They have some capability for in the dry season, at least to some degree, with the dry season, at least to some degree, with the other dedicated energy storages that are going to the dry season are least to some degree, with the power system because of their ability to genera to baseload energy. They have some capability for the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree, with the dry season are least to some degree are least to some de	o use our the te or peaking the blace o be
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That filters some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we see that in this diagram as the imports, which are regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional exchanges between their power pools. 6 run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. 7 So solar generation is important, but it doesn 8 really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in 10 power system because of their ability to genera 11 baseload energy. They have some capability for in the dry season, at least to some degree, with 12 energy available. But they don't completely report of the other dedicated energy storages that are going to the other dedicated energy storages that are going to the other dedicated energy storages that are provided with	o use our the te or peaking the blace o be
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That filters some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we see that in this diagram as the imports, which are regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional exchanges between their power pools. In the industry, there's a lot of talk about 6 run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. 7 So solar generation is important, but it doesn 7 really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in 10 power system because of their ability to genera 11 baseload energy. They have some capability for in the dry season, at least to some degree, with 12 in the dry season, at least to some degree, with 13 energy available. But they don't completely report to other dedicated energy storages that are going to other	o use our the te or peaking the olace o be the m the
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera in the dry season, at least to some degree, with regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional regional power exchanges between their power pools. The ancillary services that are provided with renergy peaking are limited to that available fro run-of-river hydro plants.	the ouse our the te or peaking the olace oo be the m the ont
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That filters some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we see that in this diagram as the imports, which are regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional exchanges between their power pools. In the industry, there's a lot of talk about solar-hydro hybridisation. On slide 28, I put some items around this. 6 run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera 10 power system because of their ability to genera 11 baseload energy. They have some capability for 12 in the dry season, at least to some degree, with 13 energy available. But they don't completely representation is important, but it doesn 14 orun-of-river hydro plants. 15 but it doesn 16 run-of-river hydro plants. 16 power system because of their ability to genera 11 baseload energy. They have some capability for 12 in the dry season, at least to some degree, with 13 energy available. But they don't completely representation is important, but it doesn 16 the run-of-river hydro plants. 17 In the dry season, at least to some degree, with 18 other dedicated energy storages that are going to other dedicated energy storages that are going to other dedicated energy storages that are provided with 17 energy peaking are limited to that available from the dry season, at least to some energy representation is important, but it doesn	the ouse our the te or peaking the olace oo be the m the ont
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That interest of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional exchanges between their power pools. In the industry, there's a lot of talk about so lar-hydro hybridisation. On slide 28, I put some la also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river hydro: it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera la power system because of their abilit	o use our the te or peaking the blace o be the m the nt ason may
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at leas	the te or peaking the oblace oo be the m the int isson may
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That in filters some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional cexchanges between their power pools. In the industry, there's a lot of talk about solar-hydro hybridisation. On slide 28, I put some items around this. or run-of-river hydro; it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro; it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro; it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro; it's just an energy producer. So solar generation is important, but it doesn really fundamentally change how we're going to run-of-river hydro plants. They will be used in power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their ability to genera to power system because of their a	the te prepared to the te te to be the the the the te to be the the the the the the the the the th
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That increase the connectivity within the grid system. That billiers some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we see that in this diagram as the imports, which are regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional exchanges between their power pools. In the industry, there's a lot of talk about solar-hydro hybridisation. On slide 28, I put some items around this. In particular, given that solar can produce energy at a very good price, what can we do with a hydropower system so we can turn that variable solar energy into a dispatchable energy that's well suited for the power	the te the place of the the the the the place of the
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That increase the connectivity within the grid system of the local variability to genera increase the connectivity within the grid system on the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to som	o use our the te or peaking the blace o be the m the nt ason may ve and the aybe get s, which
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That increase the connectivity within the grid system. That billiers some of the local variability with the solar and wind. But it's also improving regional interconnection so that the energy can be shared in a larger pool and we see that in this diagram as the imports, which are regional power exchanges between the power pools in the United States. In the case of India, they have regional exchanges between their power pools. In the industry, there's a lot of talk about solar-hydro hybridisation. On slide 28, I put some items around this. In particular, given that solar can produce energy at a very good price, what can we do with a hydropower system so we can turn that variable solar energy into a dispatchable energy that's well suited for the power	o use our the te or peaking the blace o be the m the nt ason may ve and the aybe get s, which
also be able to contend with, in the case of run-of-river, the available hydrology. So one of the keys for system planning is to increase the connectivity within the grid system. That increase the connectivity within the grid system of the local variability to genera increase the connectivity within the grid system on the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to some degree, with in the dry season, at least to som	o use our the te or peaking the blace o be the m the nt ason may ve and the aybe get s, which

29 (Pages 97 to 100)

12:41 1	the like and that's a very valuable resource within the	12:43 1	then leave it to your own discretion if you want to know
2	system, and it doesn't diminish the value of the	2	more. These are mainly observations, as opposed to
3	project; it just changes how it's considered in the	3	conclusions.
4	system.	4	(Slide 31) But I would say that recent cost trends
5	(Slide 29) So a very brief word, because how the	5	show that there will be increasing development of
6	plant is used in the system depends on its pondage.	6	variable renewable energy sources in the coming years.
7	When I talk about, "Perhaps, with more solar, we're	7	This is something that we can anticipate everywhere
8	going to have a greater use of ancillary services for	8	around the world.
9	the plants", well, that comes into the need to have some	9	We can also anticipate that hydropower will be
10	pondage available. Because you need that pondage to be	10	developed selectively to capture the ancillary services
11	able to have minor fluctuations from the power system,	11	benefits, and plants with limited flexibility will find
12	which affects the plant, which then doesn't necessarily	12	it more difficult to compete with lower cost energy
13	match directly with the flow available, so we get the	13	producers. And by "limited flexibility", I mean if
14	pondage as the buffer.	14	you're heavily constrained by environmental constraints
15	So when we compute pondage, typically we're simply	15	or physical constraints, it may affect how they work
16	taking the energy available on the day, we're seeing if	16	when they're compared against alternatives.
17	we can shift it to part of the day, and we can then	17	I would also anticipate that fewer thermal power
18	calculate the volume. It's a fairly straightforward	18	producers will be available in most power systems as we
19	computation: it just determines the number of hours of	19	go forward. You see this in North America, certainly;
20	dispatch and the volume we store.	20	the province of Alberta just this week announced that
21	When we deal with pondage for hydropower energy	21	they've finally shut their last coal-fired plant. So
22	transfer with the solar, we can calculate it the same	22	years ago I worked on design of coal-fired plants in
23	way, but then we would recall that we're not necessarily	23	Alberta, and now they're all gone. And they've replaced
24	going to use it the same way. So we look for this	24	with a system of solar, wind and natural gas.
25	ongoing transition. It's my own opinion, to be honest,	25	Wind and solar in particular require dedicated
	Page 101		Page 103
12:42 1	but I expect these run-of-river hydro plants to be used	12:45 1	energy storage, and to date this has involved large
2	much more for the ancillary services role, or the	2	battery installations in many utilities and they're
2 3	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy	2 3	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they
2 3 4	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other	2 3 4	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with
2 3 4 5	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services.	2 3 4 5	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro.
2 3 4 5 6	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some	2 3 4 5 6	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many
2 3 4 5 6 7	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for	2 3 4 5 6 7	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now: it's going to provide limited daily peaking seasonally,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but they're rather used for the overall power system. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now: it's going to provide limited daily peaking seasonally, some ancillary services benefits, and the baseload	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but they're rather used for the overall power system. You only deal with the curves as you add plants in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now: it's going to provide limited daily peaking seasonally, some ancillary services benefits, and the baseload operation in the wet season. Clearly it does not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but they're rather used for the overall power system. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now: it's going to provide limited daily peaking seasonally, some ancillary services benefits, and the baseload	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but they're rather used for the overall power system. You only deal with the curves as you add plants in combination with other plants to fulfil the whole load
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now: it's going to provide limited daily peaking seasonally, some ancillary services benefits, and the baseload operation in the wet season. Clearly it does not replace the need for dedicated energy storage for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but they're rather used for the overall power system. You only deal with the curves as you add plants in combination with other plants to fulfil the whole load duration curve.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now: it's going to provide limited daily peaking seasonally, some ancillary services benefits, and the baseload operation in the wet season. Clearly it does not replace the need for dedicated energy storage for the other renewables.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but they're rather used for the overall power system. You only deal with the curves as you add plants in combination with other plants to fulfil the whole load duration curve. Pondage: you'll be hearing a lot more about pondage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now: it's going to provide limited daily peaking seasonally, some ancillary services benefits, and the baseload operation in the wet season. Clearly it does not replace the need for dedicated energy storage for the other renewables. (Slide 30) So I've covered a lot of different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but they're rather used for the overall power system. You only deal with the curves as you add plants in combination with other plants to fulfil the whole load duration curve. Pondage: you'll be hearing a lot more about pondage coming up, but it's a function of the energy available
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now: it's going to provide limited daily peaking seasonally, some ancillary services benefits, and the baseload operation in the wet season. Clearly it does not replace the need for dedicated energy storage for the other renewables. (Slide 30) So I've covered a lot of different aspects and, to be honest, very superficially but I would like to summarise with a few observations and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but they're rather used for the overall power system. You only deal with the curves as you add plants in combination with other plants to fulfil the whole load duration curve. Pondage: you'll be hearing a lot more about pondage coming up, but it's a function of the energy available from the hydrology and the firm power available for the site and the three power, pondage and energy are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	much more for the ancillary services role, or the buffering role, than they will be for the energy transfer role, which we're going to get from other services. So whether it's used seasonally provision of some daily energy or storage, for some energy storage for peaking, or for the ancillary benefits the run-of-river hydros still have a benefit and they still have a value in the system; it's just that the value or the usage may change somewhat. Now, the Indus Waters Treaty has special definitions for "Pondage", and I don't want to go further into the calculation of it here; this will be discussed by Dr Miles in the coming days. But the role of the hydropower projects with wind and solar is going to be similar to what it's doing now: it's going to provide limited daily peaking seasonally, some ancillary services benefits, and the baseload operation in the wet season. Clearly it does not replace the need for dedicated energy storage for the other renewables. (Slide 30) So I've covered a lot of different aspects and, to be honest, very superficially but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	battery installations in many utilities and they're important because they're available year-round. So they don't have the seasonal differentiation that we get with some hydro. Pumped storage is available or is planned in many countries, India included. They have a very ambitious programme of pumped storage here. It provides a useful combination of dedicated storage, the ability to consume surpluses, and the provision of ancillary services. And with pumped storage, you can provide ancillary services both on the pumping and the generation phase, so you get it on both parts, depending on the equipment you put in. I've illustrated that power system load curves are variable and there is no single characteristic daily pattern of loading. As such, these curves are not used for the design of any individual power station, but they're rather used for the overall power system. You only deal with the curves as you add plants in combination with other plants to fulfil the whole load duration curve. Pondage: you'll be hearing a lot more about pondage coming up, but it's a function of the energy available from the hydrology and the firm power available for the

12:47 1	related, as will be discussed in more detail coming up.	12:50 1	I can say it's a difficult problem to do, because
2	It is an important factor in the optimal use of	2	you're dealing with parameters or data which changes
3	a run-of-river hydropower project, but it doesn't	3	very quickly, and at the same time you're trying to
4	replace other dedicated energy storages required in the	4	match variable power with variable production, and the
5	power system. That would conclude my prepared remarks	5	limitations of the hydro equipment. For example,
6 7	That would conclude my prepared remarks. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Rae, very much.	6	a hydro turbine governor, we talk about them being able
8	Let me just check with my colleagues and see if we	7 8	to react, but they can't react in milliseconds, which is what we're getting on the solar. So we have the other
9	have any questions.	9	buffers involved.
10	Professor Buytaert.	10	
	(12.47 pm)	10	case it's further complicated because we're trying to
12	Questions from THE COURT	12	match pondage with an eco-flow study, so that the
	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. This is	13	outcomes of the eco-flow are matched into the
14	a question that doesn't directly relate to what you	14	
15	presented here. But as you know, we've had the honour	15	So it's a long way of saying I don't have an answer.
16	of visiting the Neelum-Jhelum plant, where we got a lot	16	
17	of details about its design and its operation.	17	initial point, people have just been making what looks
18	But do you have any insights on how, for that	18	like reasonable provision for pondage and then seeing
19	particular plant, the pondage calculations were done,	19	how it works if they start modelling the systems in more
20	what factors were included to get to the number that was	20	detail.
21	eventually built?	21	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.
	MR RAE: I don't have any insight on that myself. I wasn't	22	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear.
23	directly involved with that plant, or involved at all	23	MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. It was very helpful.
24	with the plant. So I would have to defer that question	24	I have two questions. One just goes to my
25	to our colleagues in Pakistan.	25	understanding of your presentation and talking about
	Page 105		Page 107
ii			
12:48 1	I thought that question was asked during the visit,	12:51 1	turbine governors.
12:48 1 2	I thought that question was asked during the visit, was it not?	12:51 1 2	turbine governors. You said that the object here was to maintain
			_
2	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to.	2	You said that the object here was to maintain
2 3	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.	2 3	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine?
2 3 4	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry.	2 3 4 5 6	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if
2 3 4 5 6 7	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine.	2 3 4 5 6 7	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is a lot so I can't say that there's any one accepted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed. MR MINEAR: I see. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is a lot so I can't say that there's any one accepted methodology yet. I would say that it's changing so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed. MR MINEAR: I see. Thank you. My other question goes to load curves, and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is a lot so I can't say that there's any one accepted methodology yet. I would say that it's changing so dynamically that almost month by month, people are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed. MR MINEAR: I see. Thank you. My other question goes to load curves, and the variability of load curves. You mentioned that there's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is a lot so I can't say that there's any one accepted methodology yet. I would say that it's changing so dynamically that almost month by month, people are coming up with different ideas of how to do this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed. MR MINEAR: I see. Thank you. My other question goes to load curves, and the variability of load curves. You mentioned that there's seasonal variability; I imagine there's also variability
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is a lot so I can't say that there's any one accepted methodology yet. I would say that it's changing so dynamically that almost month by month, people are coming up with different ideas of how to do this. I'm involved with another project in Liberia, on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed. MR MINEAR: I see. Thank you. My other question goes to load curves, and the variability of load curves. You mentioned that there's seasonal variability; I imagine there's also variability depending on the developed character of a nation. For
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is a lot so I can't say that there's any one accepted methodology yet. I would say that it's changing so dynamically that almost month by month, people are coming up with different ideas of how to do this. I'm involved with another project in Liberia, on a panel where we're trying to integrate the hydro and the solar in a hybrid way, where we mix in a mix of batteries along with the plants in order to work in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed. MR MINEAR: I see. Thank you. My other question goes to load curves, and the variability of load curves. You mentioned that there's seasonal variability; I imagine there's also variability depending on the developed character of a nation. For instance, I would think that the load curve for a developed country would be quite different from a developing country. Am I right in that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is a lot so I can't say that there's any one accepted methodology yet. I would say that it's changing so dynamically that almost month by month, people are coming up with different ideas of how to do this. I'm involved with another project in Liberia, on a panel where we're trying to integrate the hydro and the solar in a hybrid way, where we mix in a mix of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed. MR MINEAR: I see. Thank you. My other question goes to load curves, and the variability of load curves. You mentioned that there's seasonal variability; I imagine there's also variability depending on the developed character of a nation. For instance, I would think that the load curve for a developed country would be quite different from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is a lot so I can't say that there's any one accepted methodology yet. I would say that it's changing so dynamically that almost month by month, people are coming up with different ideas of how to do this. I'm involved with another project in Liberia, on a panel where we're trying to integrate the hydro and the solar in a hybrid way, where we mix in a mix of batteries along with the plants in order to work in an isolated way from any other thermal power resources.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed. MR MINEAR: I see. Thank you. My other question goes to load curves, and the variability of load curves. You mentioned that there's seasonal variability; I imagine there's also variability depending on the developed character of a nation. For instance, I would think that the load curve for a developed country would be quite different from a developing country. Am I right in that? MR RAE: You are correct in that. And at one time we used
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was it not? SIR DANIEL: And I think it was one of the written questions, which we'll come back to. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. MR RAE: Sorry. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: That's fine. And then a second, broader question. So you very clearly sketched the evolution towards more renewables. How would the design of a plant and pondage in particular or how does that inform the calculation of pondage? Is there any established methodology to deal with the inevitable uncertainty of future changes in demand and variability? MR RAE: I would say this is an area which is changing extremely rapidly within the industry, and there is a lot so I can't say that there's any one accepted methodology yet. I would say that it's changing so dynamically that almost month by month, people are coming up with different ideas of how to do this. I'm involved with another project in Liberia, on a panel where we're trying to integrate the hydro and the solar in a hybrid way, where we mix in a mix of batteries along with the plants in order to work in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	You said that the object here was to maintain constant speed despite variation in the flow rate. Does that mean you're effectively moderating the water pressure in the turbine? MR RAE: What it does is: when the governor operates, if it senses a change in speed, it injects hydraulic oil into the system, which then gets amplified through pumps and the like, and it moves the wicket gates. So if there's a change in speed, it actually turns the wicket gates, which affects the amount of flow going through the turbine. So anything to do with frequency or any other change occurring at the generator level produces an adjustment in the flow rate through the unit; and by changing the flow rate, you're adjusting to correct the speed. MR MINEAR: I see. Thank you. My other question goes to load curves, and the variability of load curves. You mentioned that there's seasonal variability; I imagine there's also variability depending on the developed character of a nation. For instance, I would think that the load curve for a developed country would be quite different from a developing country. Am I right in that?

31 (Pages 105 to 108)

12:52 1	to use these things for generation planning and these	12:55 1	in trying to minimise the use of energy in peaks is to
2	load-stacking arrangements, and what you find is that	2	do exactly that sort of thing.
3	the slope of the curve, as you increase your level of	3	I do it at home. My hot-water heater doesn't come
4	development, this slope becomes flatter.	4	on at certain hours of the day because it costs me more
5	If you have a very one of the problems with the	5	money. But I use it in the morning, and by the time
6	smaller, isolated grid systems is the curves are always	6	I come back to it the next morning, it's hot.
7	very steep, because you were dealing with a small group.	7	There's storage of energy in your hot-water heater
8	The plant shut down that night, so the load went to zero	8	in the form of heat. If we get more people's behaviour
9	and the load disappeared.	9	to change, that we're storing at different times, then
10	So, yes, the shape depends on the level of	10	we adjust the shape of the load curves with time.
11	development in the grid.	11	MR MINEAR: One last question, again going to what
12	MR MINEAR: Just to explain why I'm asking these questions,	12	I anticipate will be some questions for Dr Miles.
13	I expect we'll talk about load curves with regard to	13	Is the shelf life of demand curves shortening over
14	India's approach to pondage, and I just want to make	14	time? I assume that these load curves are often based
15	sure I have a good understanding of some of the	15	on a 15- or 20- or 30-year time horizon.
16	variabilities in load curves.	16	MR RAE: (Slide 21) Well, you see on this figure they're
17	My other question with regard to load curves: is	17	done annually. But you can see on the figure there's
18	there a change over time with regard to changes in the	18	a kind of an evolution from 2008 to 2015, or 2015/16.
19	supply and demand of energy? For instance, in the	19	And unfortunately the curves go the opposite to what
20	United States we're using more electrical cars now, and	20	I said a minute ago. They should be becoming flatter;
21	so they are charged at night. I assume that would	21	they're actually becoming steeper in this case. But
22	change the load curve; is that right?	22	that, I think, has got to do with how the system is
23	MR RAE: Yes, electric cars are a very interesting thing,	23	evolving and the particular details here.
23	because the other thing that's happening and starting to	23	
25			But we do them every year. And when you go into
23	emerge in the US is demand management. And demand	25	a generation planning process, you tend to pick a load
	Page 109		Page 111
12:54 1	management allows you to take advantage of all those	12:57 1	duration curve like this and use that as a basis.
2	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy	2	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the
2 3	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make	2 3	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really
2 3 4	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for	2 3 4	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect.
2 3 4 5	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to	2 3 4 5	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae.
2 3 4 5 6	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the	2 3 4 5 6	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the
2 3 4 5 6 7	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the
2 3 4 5 6	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get a more uniform load through the day. We do that through	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get a more uniform load through the day. We do that through policy and through pricing. Ultimately it's going to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to see relevance in a seven-day mean minimum discharge, and in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get a more uniform load through the day. We do that through policy and through pricing. Ultimately it's going to be through more demand management, and active management.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to see relevance in a seven-day mean minimum discharge, and in developing pondage based on lower inflows than the mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get a more uniform load through the day. We do that through policy and through pricing. Ultimately it's going to be through more demand management, and active management.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to see relevance in a seven-day mean minimum discharge, and in developing pondage based on lower inflows than the mean over the course of a week.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get a more uniform load through the day. We do that through policy and through pricing. Ultimately it's going to be through more demand management, and active management. The problem with demand management is: many people in the United States don't want to give up the freedom	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to see relevance in a seven-day mean minimum discharge, and in developing pondage based on lower inflows than the mean over the course of a week. So my basic question is: why did Pakistan change its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get a more uniform load through the day. We do that through policy and through pricing. Ultimately it's going to be through more demand management, and active management. The problem with demand management is: many people in the United States don't want to give up the freedom to say, "I can operate any way I like".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to see relevance in a seven-day mean minimum discharge, and in developing pondage based on lower inflows than the mean over the course of a week. So my basic question is: why did Pakistan change its mind about how pondage should be calculated?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get a more uniform load through the day. We do that through policy and through pricing. Ultimately it's going to be through more demand management, and active management. The problem with demand management is: many people in the United States don't want to give up the freedom to say, "I can operate any way I like". But in the ultimate demand management, the utility	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to see relevance in a seven-day mean minimum discharge, and in developing pondage based on lower inflows than the mean over the course of a week. So my basic question is: why did Pakistan change its mind about how pondage should be calculated? MR RAE: I think some of those details will be dealt with by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get a more uniform load through the day. We do that through policy and through pricing. Ultimately it's going to be through more demand management, and active management. The problem with demand management is: many people in the United States don't want to give up the freedom to say, "I can operate any way I like". But in the ultimate demand management, the utility is able to control when you turn your hot-water heater on or off, and that sort of thing. Part of what we do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to see relevance in a seven-day mean minimum discharge, and in developing pondage based on lower inflows than the mean over the course of a week. So my basic question is: why did Pakistan change its mind about how pondage should be calculated? MR RAE: I think some of those details will be dealt with by Dr Miles. But I would reflect that some of what you see in those documents was driven a bit by what the Neutral
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	electric cars as one of your ways of doing energy storage. And if you can incentivise people to make their batteries available at a certain time of day for either storage or support, then you can start to mitigate the amount of other storage you need in the system. So there's a whole part of power utility development which is around the demand management part of it which goes in there. But with respect to the load curve, you're also correct, in that the time-of-use structure affects these curves. In most utilities, whether in Europe or North America, we have pricing structures which tend to favour certain times of day. The whole idea is to bring down the peak and bring up the base so that you get a more uniform load through the day. We do that through policy and through pricing. Ultimately it's going to be through more demand management, and active management. The problem with demand management is: many people in the United States don't want to give up the freedom to say, "I can operate any way I like". But in the ultimate demand management, the utility is able to control when you turn your hot-water heater	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Because there's so many other imprecisions in the analysis that somehow the finer details don't really have that much effect. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Rae. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, when Sir Daniel was introducing the speakers today, he noted that you were involved in the Baglihar proceeding. And in your presentation today, you talked a bit about: pondage needs to be computed to address the fluctuations in the water to deliver energy into the system. I think I noted on Monday that Pakistan's method for calculating maximum pondage, as was argued in the Baglihar proceeding, seems to be different from the method that is being advocated for in this proceeding. Specifically, when I looked at Exhibit 9 to Pakistan's Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to see relevance in a seven-day mean minimum discharge, and in developing pondage based on lower inflows than the mean over the course of a week. So my basic question is: why did Pakistan change its mind about how pondage should be calculated? MR RAE: I think some of those details will be dealt with by Dr Miles. But I would reflect that some of what you see

32 (Pages 109 to 112)

12:58 1	Expert was asking us for, so that in some sense we were	13:01 1 co	ome back at our normal time of 2 o'clock.
12.36 1	trying to respond in some cases to questions; in other		DANIEL: An alternative may be just to have a sort of
3	cases it appeared in the memorial or rejoinder.		ightly shortened coffee break if we feel we need it.
	But I would like to defer that question so that		may be that Stephen Fietta and Philippa Webb go
4			ther shorter than our one-and-a-half-hour planning.
5	I can look more closely at what we said in Baglihar on		
6	this particular issue, and also to Dr Miles's		E CHAIRMAN: Alright. Well, let's come back at 2.15 and
7	presentation. I think he is planning to go through the		we where we are as we move along in the afternoon, and
8	history of these.		e may have a shorter coffee break then.
9	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I welcome your reflecting on it, and		DANIEL: Thank you very much.
10	I certainly welcome Dr Miles's presentation on Friday.		E CHAIRMAN: Very good. See you at 2.15.
11	I do hope that Dr Miles doesn't tell us that he wasn't		2 pm)
12	involved in the Baglihar proceeding and therefore can't	12	(Adjourned until 2.15 pm)
13	answer the question, because obviously we are interested		1 pm)
14	in the answer.		E CHAIRMAN: Okay. With apologies for a few minutes of
15	MR RAE: If it's unclear, I am certainly happy to come back		elay in reassembling, it's good to see everyone again.
16	and help at some point, when I've reviewed the file on	16	I believe it's Mr Fietta who is up next in the
17	the particular issue.	17 or	der. So, Mr Fietta, whenever you're ready, please
18	THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Thank you very much.	18 pr	roceed.
19	So I think we have no further questions. But I do	19 MR	FIETTA: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court.
20	want to thank you very much, Mr Rae, for your	20 I I	nope you had a good lunch and we're now, I think,
21	presentation. It was very helpful to us. You have	21 re	ady to go with the next presentation.
22	taken us exactly to the lunch hour, so well done in that	22	Could we load it up? Thank you.
23	regard as well.	23 S	ubmissions on Baglihar and Kishenganga Systemic
24	Sir Daniel, I note that we are a little bit behind	24 Ir	nterpretation Issues and Response to Question (a)
25	where we thought, but we also had a fair amount of time	25 MR	FIETTA: (Slide 1) So, Mr President, members of the
			5 445
	Page 113		Page 115
13:00 1	built in as a contingency this afternoon, so it seems	14:21 1 (Court, my task today is to address you on the systemic
13:00 1 2	built in as a contingency this afternoon, so it seems that we're not under any particular time pressure. And		Court, my task today is to address you on the systemic nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to
	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And	2 i	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to
2	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at	2 i 3 y	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated
2 3 4	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time	2 i 3 y 4 6	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023.
2 3 4 5	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any	2 i 3 y 4 6	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in
2 3 4	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties.	2 i 3 y 4 6 5 5 6 y	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You
2 3 4 5 6 7	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine	2 i 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective.	2 i 3 y 4 6 5 5 6 y 7 v 8 I	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to	2 i 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch	2 i 3 y 4 6 6 5 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect	2 i 3 y 4 6 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t 11	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would	2 i 3 y 4 6 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t 11 12 s	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. I will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some time into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb	2 i 3 y 4 6 5 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her	2 i 3 y 4 6 5 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 i i	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 II 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 H	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 F 16 c	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some time into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end of day.	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 H 16 c 17	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6. PO No. 6 was, of course, issued simultaneously with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end of day. I wonder whether we might have a little bit of	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 F 16 c 17 18 t	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of ntroduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6. PO No. 6 was, of course, issued simultaneously with the Court's Award on Competence of the same date, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end of day. I wonder whether we might have a little bit of a latitude of 10-15 minutes at the end of the day to	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 F 16 c 17 18 t 19 a	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6. PO No. 6 was, of course, issued simultaneously with the Court's Award on Competence of the same date, and against the backdrop of Pakistan's previous submission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end of day. I wonder whether we might have a little bit of a latitude of 10-15 minutes at the end of the day to complete Professor Webb's submissions, so that we've got	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 II 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 IF 16 c 17 18 t 19 a 20 c	nterpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6. PO No. 6 was, of course, issued simultaneously with the Court's Award on Competence of the same date, and against the backdrop of Pakistan's previous submission of a statement on "Coordination between the Court of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end of day. I wonder whether we might have a little bit of a latitude of 10-15 minutes at the end of the day to complete Professor Webb's submissions, so that we've got then a clear run on some of the paragraph 8 stuff	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 I 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 I 16 c 17 18 t 19 a 20 c 21 A	Interpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. Will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6. PO No. 6 was, of course, issued simultaneously with the Court's Award on Competence of the same date, and against the backdrop of Pakistan's previous submission of a statement on "Coordination between the Court of Arbitration and the Neutral Expert". In that statement,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end of day. I wonder whether we might have a little bit of a latitude of 10-15 minutes at the end of the day to complete Professor Webb's submissions, so that we've got then a clear run on some of the paragraph 8 stuff tomorrow, or whether you want to have your 5.30 as	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 II 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 H 16 c 17 18 t 19 a 20 c 21 A 22 H	Interpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. Will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6. PO No. 6 was, of course, issued simultaneously with the Court's Award on Competence of the same date, and against the backdrop of Pakistan's previous submission of a statement on "Coordination between the Court of Arbitration and the Neutral Expert". In that statement, Pakistan had proposed a sequential exercise of functions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end of day. I wonder whether we might have a little bit of a latitude of 10-15 minutes at the end of the day to complete Professor Webb's submissions, so that we've got then a clear run on some of the paragraph 8 stuff tomorrow, or whether you want to have your 5.30 as a sharp guillotine for the end of the day.	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 II 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 IF 16 c 17 18 t 19 a 20 c 21 A 22 IF 23 b	Interpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. Will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6. PO No. 6 was, of course, issued simultaneously with the Court's Award on Competence of the same date, and against the backdrop of Pakistan's previous submission of a statement on "Coordination between the Court of Arbitration and the Neutral Expert". In that statement, Pakistan had proposed a sequential exercise of functions between this Court and the parallel Neutral Expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end of day. I wonder whether we might have a little bit of a latitude of 10-15 minutes at the end of the day to complete Professor Webb's submissions, so that we've got then a clear run on some of the paragraph 8 stuff tomorrow, or whether you want to have your 5.30 as a sharp guillotine for the end of the day. THE CHAIRMAN: I think we want to keep 5.30 relatively	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 II 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 H 16 c 17 18 t 19 a 20 c 21 A 22 H 22 H 23 t 24 F	Interpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. Will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6. PO No. 6 was, of course, issued simultaneously with the Court's Award on Competence of the same date, and against the backdrop of Pakistan's previous submission of a statement on "Coordination between the Court of Arbitration and the Neutral Expert". In that statement, Pakistan had proposed a sequential exercise of functions between this Court and the parallel Neutral Expert proceeding as a means of effectively settling the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that we're not under any particular time pressure. And I'm wondering in that regard if we might reconvene at 2.15 rather than 2.00, to give us a little bit more time for a lunch break, unless you think that poses any difficulties. SIR DANIEL: No, Mr Chairman, I think that would be fine from our perspective. Just to give you a sense of how we were hoping to plan the rest of the day, immediately after the lunch break, Stephen Fietta will be coming on. And we expect that his submissions, barring too many questions, would take us up to the coffee break. And then Professor Webb just after the coffee break. And once again, her submissions, including some questions not a huge volume of questions should take us through to the end of day. I wonder whether we might have a little bit of a latitude of 10-15 minutes at the end of the day to complete Professor Webb's submissions, so that we've got then a clear run on some of the paragraph 8 stuff tomorrow, or whether you want to have your 5.30 as a sharp guillotine for the end of the day.	2 ii 3 y 4 6 5 6 y 7 v 8 II 9 v 10 t 11 12 s 13 r 14 ii 15 H 16 c 17 18 t 19 a 20 c 21 A 22 H 22 H 23 t 24 F	Interpretation issues under the Treaty and respond to your question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6, dated 5 July 2023. You should have your latest party pack from me in your folders: I think it should be at tabs 7 and 8. You won't need to go to it for now, until I prompt you. Will take you to tab 8 when we get there, where we have another A3 presentation, but that will be some ime into my address. (Slide 2) Before I elaborate on Pakistan's substantive responses to question (a), I would like to make a number of high-level remarks by way of introduction and context to the Court's question. First, a recap, briefly, of the origins and context of question (a) in Procedural Order No. 6. PO No. 6 was, of course, issued simultaneously with the Court's Award on Competence of the same date, and against the backdrop of Pakistan's previous submission of a statement on "Coordination between the Court of Arbitration and the Neutral Expert". In that statement, Pakistan had proposed a sequential exercise of functions between this Court and the parallel Neutral Expert

33 (Pages 113 to 116)

14:23 1	to the Treaty, while at the same time ensuring	14:26 1	since 2013 with respect to pondage and related issues
2	coordination between the two fora and avoiding the risk	2	now before you. Pakistan and its Commissioner have
3	of inconsistent decisions with respect to the same or	3	repeatedly cited the rulings of the Court in the 2013
4	related matters.	4	Kishenganga awards, while India and its Commissioner
5	As the Court noted at the beginning of its analysis	5	have repeatedly cited the earlier 2007 determination of
6	at paragraph 23 of PO No. 6:	6	the Neutral Expert in the Baglihar case.
7	" the dispute presently before the Court arises in circumstances that have seen both the constitution of	7	It's against this backdrop of, first, ongoing
8		8	parallel proceedings before a Court and Neutral Expert
9	a Court of Arbitration and the appointment of a Neutral Expert."	9 10	and, second, inconsistent previous decisions of a Court and Neutral Expert that this Court has raised its
10 11	The Court continued at paragraph 24, indicating	10	question (a). That question essentially concerns the
12	that:	12	legal effect of the past decisions of dispute resolution
13	"It is apparent that the dispute placed before	13	bodies established pursuant to Article IX of the Treaty,
14	this Court and the matters referred to the Neutral	14	both upon the parties to the Treaty and upon subsequent
15	Expert involve a significant degree of overlap"	15	dispute resolution bodies.
16	Namely in respect of what the Court described in	16	(Slide 3) So at this point I can take you to my
17	shorthand as "the KHEP/RHEP Design and Operation	17	first slide, which is Procedural Order No. 6 and the
18	Issues"; in other words, issues concerning the	18	terms of the question, which merit review before
19	application of the Treaty to the design of India's	19	I continue. But I'm sure they are sufficiently familiar
20	Kishenganga and Ratle HEPs.	20	to the Court for me not to need to read them again into
21	"At the same time", the Court observed:	21	the record.
22	" it is also apparent that the dispute placed	22	Those who are well versed in the Treaty and its
23	before this Court includes the determination of certain	23	jurisprudence may ask why this question is necessary.
24	general questions concerning the interpretation or	24	After all, as the Court itself noted in PO No. 6, and as
25	application of the Treaty that are not before the	25	I will explain, the Treaty provides answers to many
	Page 117		Page 119
14.24 1	Newton I Francis II	14.07 1	
14:24 1	Neutral Expert."	14:27 1	aspects of this question, and the jurisprudence, in the
2 3	This distinction drawn by the Court, between the general issues of interpretation and application of the	2 3	form of the Kishenganga decision, fills in the gaps. But this question remains of critical importance,
4	Treaty that are only before this Court and the specific	4	notwithstanding the text of the Treaty and
5	issues of application of the Treaty that are also before	5	notwithstanding the clear holdings of the Kishenganga
6	the Neutral Expert, was emphasised again by the Court at	6	Court. And it remains of critical importance today for
7	paragraph 32 of its order.	7	three reasons.
8	At paragraph 34 of its order, the Court therefore	8	First India continues to adopt positions which
9	decided to organise the proceedings "in phases",	9	manifestly contradict the Treaty and its Article IX
10	starting with "a series of issues relating to the	10	jurisprudence, including by refuting the binding and
11	interpretation or application of the Treaty that are not	11	precedential nature of the awards in the Kishenganga
12	part of the difference before the Neutral Expert".	12	case, and by asserting a quasi-precedential role for the
13	So that's my first orientation of this question,	13	earlier Baglihar expert determination, even in respect
14	which will be familiar, of course.	14	of Indian HEPs yet to be designed or constructed on the
15	There is a second point, though, of context to your	15	Western Rivers. And I will explain my "quasi" reference
16	question (a): namely, of course, the dispute before you	16	shortly, in connection with the quasi-precedential role
17	arises in circumstances where a previous Court of	17	given by India to Baglihar.
18	Arbitration, in the Kishenganga case, and a previous	18	Second, India continues to rely on Baglihar while
19	Neutral Expert, in the Baglihar case, have rendered	19	pursuing a parallel proceeding before another Neutral
20	decisions which are, in significant parts, mutually	20	Expert, which, as PO6 observes, concerns certain design
21	incompatible, and which potentially overlap with parts	21	and operation questions that are essentially identical
22	of the dispute presently before you.	22	to some of the questions before this Court.
23	Indeed, as we will see, those two mutually	23	And third, this question is critical because,
24	incompatible decisions have been cited by the parties'	24	accordingly, it is inevitable that questions will arise
25	Indus Waters Commissioners during their discussions	25	in both proceedings concerning not only the legal status
	Page 118		Page 120

34 (Pages 117 to 120)

14:29	1	of previous decisions of the Baglihar Expert and	14:32 1	Indian Commissioner, particularly with respect to
	2	Kishenganga Court, but questions will also arise	2	India's designs of the KHEP and RHEP, provide a fulsome
	3	concerning the legal status of previous decisions of	3	record of the ongoing disagreement between Pakistan and
	4	this Court.	4	India about the legal relevance and precedential value
	5	Pakistan therefore welcomes the opportunity in this	5	of the Baglihar and Kishenganga decisions.
	6	phase to lay to rest the important systemic issues of	6	In short, first, Pakistan has consistently
	7	treaty interpretation and application raised by the	7	maintained that the partial and final awards in
	8	Court's question (a).	8	Kishenganga have binding and precedential effect under
	9	This Court's decision on question (a) will confirm,	9	the Treaty, both as regards the KHEP and as regards all
	10	once and for all, the extent to which the previous	10	other Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. This flows
	11	decisions of the Baglihar Neutral Expert and the	11	from the Court's exclusive role in deciding disputed
	12	Kishenganga Court of Arbitration are final and binding,	12	questions related to systemic application or
	13	both for the parties, for the Court of Arbitration and	13	interpretation in this case it's systemic
	14	for the Neutral Expert. The Court's decision on	14	interpretation, of course of the Treaty.
	15	question (a) will also confirm the binding nature of the decisions of this Court already made, and that it is yet	15	The only exception to the precedential effect of the
	16	•	16 17	Kishenganga awards, which was noted by the Court itself in Kishenganga, is those Indian HEPs that were already
	17 18	to make, in this proceeding. Already in its Award on Competence, this Court has	18	in operation or already under construction, with no
	19	made decisions falling within each of the four	19	objection by Pakistan, as at 18 February 2013; in other
	20	categories numbered (i) to (iv) in the Court's	20	words, those Indian HEPs that were already in operation
	21	question (a): competence, matters of fact,	21	or construction on the Western Rivers, without protest
	22	interpretation of the Treaty and application of the	22	by Pakistan, as at the date of the Kishenganga partial
	23	Treaty in particular circumstances. The latter two	23	award.
	24	categories of the Court's question are addressed in the	24	So that's Pakistan's approach to Kishenganga.
	25	dispositif of your Competence Award. Elsewhere in your	25	As regards Baglihar, Pakistan has consistently
		Page 121		Page 123
14:31	1	Competence Award, you addressed issue of fact critical	14:34 1	maintained that the Baglihar determination of
	2	to your competence; and you addressed issues of	2	Maître Lafitte has no precedential status or value
	3	competence, of course.	3	beyond the specific issues addressed in that
	4	So on my next slide (4), I show the dispositif.	4	determination as regards the Baglihar HEP. In other
	5	I apologise for the size of the text on this slide, but	5	words, the Baglihar determination has no precedential
	6	I think we don't need to go through the words as such.	6	status or value at all for other HEPs on the
	7	It shows the Award on Competence dispositif with	7	Western Rivers.
	8	colouring, red and blue, and that's to help orientate	8	This is because, under the Treaty, Neutral Experts
	9	how that decision fits in with the categories of	9	are not competent to decide disputed questions related
	10	decision that you identify in question (a). And in	10	to systemic interpretation or application. They're only
	11	particular, in blue, your decision on competence, those	11	competent to resolve a finite list of technical issues
	12	two paragraphs, B and G, address issues of	12	or disputes identified in the Treaty, and only in
	13	interpretation of the Treaty. And in red, there are	13	respect of the individual plant or plants at which such
	14	a number of decisions on application of the Treaty in	14 15	specific disputes have arisen that have been referred to
	15	the particular factual circumstances of this case. So this issue is already live as regards the	15 16	the relevant Neutral Expert.
	16	, ,		So the Neutral Expert in Baglihar was competent,
	17 18	consequences of your own decisions so far in this proceeding.	17 18	under Annexure F of the Treaty, to resolve only the technical disputes between the parties about compliance
	18 19	(Slide 5) I'd like to address for a few minutes the	18 19	of the Baglihar plant with Annex D, paragraphs 8(a)
	20	parties' ongoing differences with regard to the legal	20	related to freeboard, 8(c) related to pondage, 8(e)
	21	status and relevance of Baglihar and Kishenganga.	20	related to freeboard, 8(c) related to pointage, 8(e) related to gated spillways and 8(f) related to turbine
		The parties' ongoing differences with regard to that	22	intakes; nothing else.
	22.	paraeo organia diriotorioco mini loguid to nint	44	
	22 23		23	In taking these positions with respect to Baglihar
	23	issue are manifest. As subsections 2F.1 and 2F.2 of	23 24	In taking these positions with respect to Baglihar and Kishenganga, Pakistan has relied both on the
		issue are manifest. As subsections 2F.1 and 2F.2 of Pakistan's Memorial recount, the discussions between the	23 24 25	and Kishenganga, Pakistan has relied both on the
	23 24	issue are manifest. As subsections 2F.1 and 2F.2 of Pakistan's Memorial recount, the discussions between the PCIW, the Pakistani Commissioner, and the ICIW, the	24	and Kishenganga, Pakistan has relied both on the applicable wording of the Treaty and the Court's clear,
	23 24	issue are manifest. As subsections 2F.1 and 2F.2 of Pakistan's Memorial recount, the discussions between the	24	and Kishenganga, Pakistan has relied both on the

· ·			
14:35 1	binding and definitive holdings in Kishenganga about the	14:39 1	essential to the dispute resolution process under the
2	contrasting legal status and scope of Court of	2	Treaty.
3	Arbitration and Neutral Expert decisions under the	3	It's instructive to pause then here to recall in
4	Treaty. So when I address you on the detail of	4	more precise terms the record of the Indus Waters
5	Pakistan's submission on question (a), I will spend some	5	Commission meetings between 2013 and 2015 so this is
6	time on, first of all, the text of the Treaty, of	6	the meetings held after the Kishenganga awards and
7	course; and second, the relevant paragraphs in the	7	the associated correspondence between the parties
8	Kishenganga awards, of which there are a number.	8	shortly before they each commenced the dispute
9	I've looked at Pakistan's consistent positions	9	resolution procedures under Article IX that are ongoing
10	vis-à-vis Kishenganga and Baglihar. Turning to India,	10	today. That record demonstrates both the consistency of
11	by contrast, India consistently dismisses the	11	Pakistan's positions on issues raised by question (a)
12	precedential value of the Kishenganga awards, including	12	and the limits of India's own position, which was
13	in connection with its designs for KHEP and RHEP. India	13	notably cautious with respect to the legal status of the
14	also dismisses those passages in the Kishenganga partial	14	Baglihar decision.
15	award that are clear, definitive and binding as regards	15	So I'm going to take you through four slides which
16	the legal status and scope of Court and Neutral Expert	16	summarise the positions of each party taken in the Indus
17	decisions. Instead, India continues to rely on the	17	Waters Commission meetings following the Kishenganga
18	previous Baglihar Neutral Expert determination when	18	case.
19	attempting to justify its other HEP designs under the	19	(Slide 6) So first of all, we have the record of the
20	Treaty.	20	108th meeting of the Commission in March 2013, dated
21	But one very important point to note and I will	21	24 September; that's P-70.
22	be taking you to the detail of this in connection with	22	Here we have consistent statements by the Pakistan
23	India's position is that India has never gone so far	23	Commissioner as to the "conclusive" nature of the
24	as asserting that the Baglihar determination is legally	24	Kishenganga decision on the question of drawdown
25	binding beyond the Baglihar plant, whether on a Court of	25	flushing; importantly here, both in respect of plant
	Page 125		Page 127
	1 age 123		1 age 127
14:37 1	Arbitration or on the parties with respect to plants	14:40 1	specific disputes and "in general for all the future
2	other than Baglihar. Instead, it asserts only that the	2	run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers".
3	determination is a "guideline" for other Indian HEPs on	3	And again, in relation to Baglihar, the Pakistani
4	the Western Rivers, or "authoritative", but not	4	Commissioner stated that:
5	explicitly not "binding". And we'll see that when	5	"Pakistan did not consider the interpretation
6	I take you to the record.	6	provided by the [Neutral Expert] in Baglihar as
7	This was what I meant earlier when I said that	7	a valid interpretation of the Treaty."
8	India's position asserts really that Baglihar only has	8	
9		o	Here we see the Indian Commissioner taking
	quasi-precedential value.	9	Here we see the Indian Commissioner taking a slightly more cautious position in respect of the
10	quasi-precedential value. This is telling for the purposes of your		
10 11		9	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the
	This is telling for the purposes of your	9 10	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar.
11	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it	9 10 11	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that:
11 12	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the	9 10 11 12	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan
11 12 13	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty."
11 12 13 14	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the	9 10 11 12 13 14	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of
11 12 13 14 15	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty."
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions. This must be wrong. It's nonsensical for the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion. At the next meeting, on the next slide (7) or
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions. This must be wrong. It's nonsensical for the effective resolution of disputes or the efficient, even,	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion. At the next meeting, on the next slide (7) or next but one, the 110th meeting (P-24) in 2014, the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions. This must be wrong. It's nonsensical for the effective resolution of disputes or the efficient, even, resolution of disputes even under the Treaty; and, as	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion. At the next meeting, on the next slide (7) or next but one, the 110th meeting (P-24) in 2014, the Pakistan Commissioner again adopted a consistent
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions. This must be wrong. It's nonsensical for the effective resolution of disputes or the efficient, even, resolution of disputes even under the Treaty; and, as I will explain, it is also inimical to doctrines of	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion. At the next meeting, on the next slide (7) or next but one, the 110th meeting (P-24) in 2014, the Pakistan Commissioner again adopted a consistent approach. He highlighted the binding quality of the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions. This must be wrong. It's nonsensical for the effective resolution of disputes or the efficient, even, resolution of disputes even under the Treaty; and, as I will explain, it is also inimical to doctrines of res judicata and legal certainty and predictability.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion. At the next meeting, on the next slide (7) or next but one, the 110th meeting (P-24) in 2014, the Pakistan Commissioner again adopted a consistent approach. He highlighted the binding quality of the Kishenganga Court decision, both in respect of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions. This must be wrong. It's nonsensical for the effective resolution of disputes or the efficient, even, resolution of disputes even under the Treaty; and, as I will explain, it is also inimical to doctrines of res judicata and legal certainty and predictability. And that latter principle has been recognised both by	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion. At the next meeting, on the next slide (7) or next but one, the 110th meeting (P-24) in 2014, the Pakistan Commissioner again adopted a consistent approach. He highlighted the binding quality of the Kishenganga Court decision, both in respect of plant-specific disputes and more generally on the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions. This must be wrong. It's nonsensical for the effective resolution of disputes or the efficient, even, resolution of disputes even under the Treaty; and, as I will explain, it is also inimical to doctrines of res judicata and legal certainty and predictability.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion. At the next meeting, on the next slide (7) or next but one, the 110th meeting (P-24) in 2014, the Pakistan Commissioner again adopted a consistent approach. He highlighted the binding quality of the Kishenganga Court decision, both in respect of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions. This must be wrong. It's nonsensical for the effective resolution of disputes or the efficient, even, resolution of disputes even under the Treaty; and, as I will explain, it is also inimical to doctrines of res judicata and legal certainty and predictability. And that latter principle has been recognised both by the Baglihar Expert and by the Kishenganga Court as	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion. At the next meeting, on the next slide (7) or next but one, the 110th meeting (P-24) in 2014, the Pakistan Commissioner again adopted a consistent approach. He highlighted the binding quality of the Kishenganga Court decision, both in respect of plant-specific disputes and more generally on the Western Rivers. And he indicated that that extended to
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is telling for the purposes of your question (a), of course, because, first, even India has never gone so far as to say that Baglihar has general binding effect as a matter of law; and second, it appears that in India's view, especially following the unfavourable Kishenganga awards, in its view, there is no dispute resolution body with competence under the Treaty to render general and binding interpretative decisions. This must be wrong. It's nonsensical for the effective resolution of disputes or the efficient, even, resolution of disputes even under the Treaty; and, as I will explain, it is also inimical to doctrines of res judicata and legal certainty and predictability. And that latter principle has been recognised both by	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a slightly more cautious position in respect of the decision on which India relies, namely Baglihar. He said that: " irrespective of the views held by the Pakistan Commissioner on the [Expert]'s interpretations in Baglihar Pondage is governed by the provisions of the Treaty." So at that point there was no explicit reliance on Baglihar itself for the purposes of the other HEPs under discussion. At the next meeting, on the next slide (7) or next but one, the 110th meeting (P-24) in 2014, the Pakistan Commissioner again adopted a consistent approach. He highlighted the binding quality of the Kishenganga Court decision, both in respect of plant-specific disputes and more generally on the

14:41 1			
17.71 1	the:	14:44 1	to the elements of the design and operation of the
2	" settled matter that India cannot drawdown the	2	specific plant considered by that Expert."
3	reservoir below [dead storage level] except in	3	So the parties' position are clear, and the limits
4	an unforeseen emergency not only [at] Kishenganga	4	of the Indian position on this issue are clear,
5	but in general for all the future run-of-river HEPs on	5	particularly in relation to Baglihar.
6	the Western Rivers."	6	But despite the clarity of both the Treaty and the
7	He dismissed the reasoning of the Neutral Expert on	7	Kishenganga awards on these issues raised in
8	the substance in Baglihar and rejected its purported	8	question (a), a further final and definitive ruling is
9	erga omnes effect by reference to the finding of the	9	warranted so as to settle this ongoing dispute in
10	Kishenganga Court on that issue. And he stated that	10	relation to the legal and precedential status of the
11	while the Baglihar Neutral Expert's decision was "final	11	Baglihar and Kishenganga determinations.
12	and binding in respect of the particular matter on which	12	Otherwise, as the Pakistani Commissioner indicated
13	the decision [was] made", the Neutral Expert's	13	in his letter on 25 February 2016 I'll just finish
14	interpretation on maximum pondage "could not be accepted	14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
15	as a guideline". And we'll see he picked up that term	15	"[India's] positions on these and related issues,
16	from India.	16	which Pakistan rejects, present legal questions of
17	So in the next slide (8), you will see at the same	17	Treaty interpretation which will inevitably recur as
18	meeting, the 110th meeting, the Indian Commissioner put	18	India proceeds with other HEP projects on the
19	forward as "guideline" the methodology proposed by the	19	Western Rivers."
20	Baglihar Expert for calculating maximum pondage. He	20	That's Exhibit P-23.
21	stated that:	21	Thank you for bearing with me, Mr Chairman.
22	" an unambiguous neutral view is available in the	22	THE CHAIRMAN: No, of course. Thank you, Mr Fietta.
23	Baglihar determination which can always serve as	23	So it may be you are going to get to this in due
24	[a] guideline [in relation to] all run of the river	24	course, but while it's clear from the quotes and
25	[HEPs] on [the] Western Rivers"	25	extracts you provided the parties' respective positions
	Page 129		Page 131
	1 age 129		1 age 131
14:43 1	And he noted that:	14:45 1	on Baglihar, it's a little bit less clear to me what
2	"Though the determination of pondage by the	2	respective positions are on Kishenganga.
3	Neutral Expert was for Baglihar"	3	Earlier in your presentation, you said that India
4	So he conceded that point:	4	"dismisses" the Kishenganga Court's decision. And I'm
5	" the same can be considered as [again]	5	
6		3	wondering: by that, do you mean it basically doesn't
	a guideline for other projects of India on the	6	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively
7	Western Rivers."	6 7	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to
7 8	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW	6	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect
7 8 9	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar	6 7 8 9	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants?
7 8 9 10	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these	6 7 8 9 10	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question.
7 8 9 10 11	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and	6 7 8 9 10	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail
7 8 9 10 11 12	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding,
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar:	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding generally for all such plants."	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that may be because it is aware of the weakness of its legal
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding generally for all such plants." And addressing India's position in his following	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that may be because it is aware of the weakness of its legal position. It's clear though that its position on the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding generally for all such plants." And addressing India's position in his following letter in February 2016, he said:	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that may be because it is aware of the weakness of its legal position. It's clear though that its position on the Baglihar determination completely disregards any
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding generally for all such plants." And addressing India's position in his following letter in February 2016, he said: "India's reliance upon the Neutral Expert's decision	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that may be because it is aware of the weakness of its legal position. It's clear though that its position on the Baglihar determination completely disregards any precedential value for the Kishenganga award. Because
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding generally for all such plants." And addressing India's position in his following letter in February 2016, he said: "India's reliance upon the Neutral Expert's decision on pondage with respect to Baglihar was	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that may be because it is aware of the weakness of its legal position. It's clear though that its position on the Baglihar determination completely disregards any precedential value for the Kishenganga award. Because if the Kishenganga award had general precedential value
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding generally for all such plants." And addressing India's position in his following letter in February 2016, he said: "India's reliance upon the Neutral Expert's decision on pondage with respect to Baglihar was 'invalid' because [following] Kishenganga '(t)he	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that may be because it is aware of the weakness of its legal position. It's clear though that its position on the Baglihar determination completely disregards any precedential value for the Kishenganga award. Because if the Kishenganga award had general precedential value and was dispositive, for example, on the question of
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding generally for all such plants." And addressing India's position in his following letter in February 2016, he said: "India's reliance upon the Neutral Expert's decision on pondage with respect to Baglihar was	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that may be because it is aware of the weakness of its legal position. It's clear though that its position on the Baglihar determination completely disregards any precedential value for the Kishenganga award. Because if the Kishenganga award had general precedential value
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding generally for all such plants." And addressing India's position in his following letter in February 2016, he said: "India's reliance upon the Neutral Expert's decision on pondage with respect to Baglihar was 'invalid' because [following] Kishenganga '(t)he	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that may be because it is aware of the weakness of its legal position. It's clear though that its position on the Baglihar determination completely disregards any precedential value for the Kishenganga award. Because if the Kishenganga award had general precedential value and was dispositive, for example, on the question of
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Western Rivers." Then at the next meeting, in February 2015, the PCIW again rejected any broader effect for the Baglihar decision. And we go to the next slide (9). And these positions were taken up in correspondence in 2015 and 2016. Here we have the PCIW's letters at P-26 and P-23, the first one in January 2015, reiterating that Baglihar: " had no general precedential value was only binding in the specific case before him but not in respect of [other] plants, while the decision of the Court of Arbitration, by contrast, would be binding generally for all such plants." And addressing India's position in his following letter in February 2016, he said: "India's reliance upon the Neutral Expert's decision on pondage with respect to Baglihar was 'invalid' because [following] Kishenganga '(t)he effect of a neutral expert's determination is restricted	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	talk about it, or do you mean that they've affirmatively said it does not have a binding quality with respect to decisions that are to be taken thereafter with respect to plants? MR FIETTA: Thank you for the question. We will see India's position in a little more detail as we go to the record in the Kishenganga proceeding, which of course looked at this issue, and even on the request for interpretation of that decision, of the partial award. India's position certainly is that it does not repeatedly and expressly dismiss the precedential value of the Kishenganga award. One would assume that that may be because it is aware of the weakness of its legal position. It's clear though that its position on the Baglihar determination completely disregards any precedential value for the Kishenganga award. Because if the Kishenganga award had general precedential value and was dispositive, for example, on the question of drawdown flushing, then India would not be able to adopt

37 (Pages 129 to 132)

14.47	de continuit de la finalisma (IIII D. III	14.50 1	handandark and the same
14:47 1	the position it does, in reliance still on Baglihar, in	14:50 1	he or she need not be and invariably will not be
2	connection with that issue.	2	a lawyer, at least not a lawyer skilled in the
3	We will see though the precise wording, as far as	3	interpretation and application of treaties.
4	India is willing to go in connection with that issue,	4 5	As such, while a Neutral Expert may have to engage
5	when we look at the record from the Kishenganga case.	5	in some Treaty interpretation in order to resolve
6	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm interested in what's happening	6	a technical dispute with relation to a specific HEP
7	post-Kishenganga. Whatever they might have said before	7	under Annexure F, he or she cannot do so on a systemic
8	the Kishenganga Court isn't directly speaking to the	8	basis, or in any way that is generally binding on the
9	issue of India's posture after the Court of Arbitration	9	parties and other dispute resolution bodies under the
10 11	issues its decision.	10	Treaty. The decision only goes so far as the particular HEP concerned.
11 12	From what you've said so far, it sounds as though	11 12	
12	they have never, in your reading of the record, expressly said that the Kishenganga Court's	12	Unfortunately, the Neutral Expert in the Baglihar
13 14	expressly said that the Kishenganga Court's determination/judgment/award does not have precedential	13 14	case, Maître Lafitte, did take it upon himself to engage in a lengthy and in some ways questionable Treaty
14 15	effect; it's more in the nature of simply not giving it	14	in a lengthy and in some ways questionable Treaty interpretation exercise. He extended that analysis of
15 16	much attention in the course of the interactions between	15 16	interpretation exercise. He extended that analysis of international law under the Vienna Convention,
17	the parties. Is that a correct understanding?	16	et cetera, far beyond the technical paragraphs at issue
17	MR FIETTA: Well, it is clearly I think Pakistan's	17	under Annexure D, into putative interpretations of the
19	position has been very clear as regards the precedential	18	Treaty's preamble, its object and purpose, of
20	effect of Kishenganga. And in those meetings, India has	20	Article III, of Article XI, of Article XII. And he
20	certainly never agreed in any way with that position.	20	included in his determination, as you will know,
22	I will check one last time for you before next week.	22	a seven-page section, section 5.1, specifically on the
23	My understanding of the record is though because	23	topic of Treaty interpretation; not in relation to
24	I don't want to make a definitive statement but my	24	Annexure D at all, and the specific technical issues
25	clear understanding of the record on that point is that	25	that he was concerned with, but much more broadly in
			·
	Page 133		Page 135
14:49 1	India has never made a legal statement in those terms	14:52 1	connection with the issues that I described.
2	denying the precedential effect of the Kishenganga	2	The seven-member Court of Arbitration in Kishenganga
3	determinations under the Treaty. But I will check, as	3	unanimously confirmed later that his approach was
4	a matter of fact, on that point.	4	"misplaced" and wrong in law. Among other errors, he
5	I think and this is the tenor of my submission	5	strayed into purporting to interpret the Treaty
6	that India's position is much more nuanced and carefully	6	provisions that were plainly not within his competence.
7	framed so as to avoid expressly making out that	7	He took a superficial view of the Treaty's object and
8	position. But I will confirm it, if needed, next week.	8	purpose and the circumstances of its conclusion. And in
9 10	One final point before I get to the detail of question (a). Pakistan's consistent position, which	9 10	passages that were explicitly rejected by the Court of Arbitration, he determined that any interpretation of
10		10	Arbitration, he determined that any interpretation of Annexure D must take into account the state-of-the-art
11		12	design and the best and latest practices in the field of
12		13	construction and operation of hydroelectric plants.
13	*	13	As we've seen, India has repeatedly cited that
15		15	determination as a "guideline", including in connection
16		16	with India's KHEP and RHEP, notwithstanding the fact
17	• •	17	that it was unanimously rejected by the Kishenganga
18		18	Court as being both inconsistent with a proper
19		19	interpretation of the Treaty and of no precedential
20		20	value beyond the Baglihar plant. As we'll explain, the
21		21	Kishenganga Court's holdings in that regard, unlike
22		22	those of the Baglihar Neutral Expert, are of general
23	approximation on com		
23		23	binding and otherwise controlling effect.
24	a plant-specific and systemic, generic basis. By contrast, any Neutral Expert is a single	24	So the distinction between the competencies of
	a plant-specific and systemic, generic basis. By contrast, any Neutral Expert is a single		-
24	a plant-specific and systemic, generic basis. By contrast, any Neutral Expert is a single	24	So the distinction between the competencies of
24	a plant-specific and systemic, generic basis. By contrast, any Neutral Expert is a single individual who must be a highly qualified engineer. But	24	So the distinction between the competencies of Courts of Arbitration and Neutral Experts also serves to

38 (Pages 133 to 136)

14:53	1	avoid inconsistent decisions being made with respect to	14:57 1	you have posed in relation to, first of all, Courts of
	2	the generic matters of Treaty interpretation or	2	Arbitration, the binding effect of Court of Arbitration
	3	application.	3	decisions; and secondly, the binding effect, or not, of
	4	This isn't to say that some specific matters, such	4	Neutral Expert decisions.
	5	as those of a technical nature related to the design of	5	I'm going to take you through the reasoning set out
	6	a particular HEP, it's not to say that those issues	6	in each of those matrices and I'll take you through each
	7	cannot be before both a Court and a Neutral Expert at	7	of the Treaty provisions and each of the decisions in
	8	the same time, where the necessary mutual consent of the	8	paragraphs that we cite to there. And there's a simple
	9	parties exists. This much is acknowledged in your own	9	colour code, just for your ease of reference later,
	10	Procedural Order No. 6. But as the Court continued in	10	where the green indicates binding decisions, the blue
	11	its PO6 after paragraph 28, you said:	11	indicates binding decisions with respect to matters
	12	"In such circumstances, there is a general duty	12	within the competence of a Neutral Expert and the red
	13	to exercise competence in such a manner as to	13	indicates non-binding decisions.
	14	facilitate the actual resolution of the Parties' dispute	14	I'm going to take you through our reasoning as
	15	and to avoid the risks of duplicative proceedings or	15	reflected and summarised in those matrices. But I just
	16	conflicting decisions."	16	wanted to make sure we answered every one of the
	17	And you then said that a general duty of "mutual	17	32 questions implied in question (a).
	18	respect and comity" applies.	18	So the remainder of my presentation will address
	19	And as the Baglihar determination and Kishenganga	19	question (a) with respect to, first, the decisions of
	20	awards show, the fact that a Neutral Expert has reached	20	a Court of Arbitration, and that's matrix 1; and second,
	21	one conclusion on interpretation of the Treaty with	21	decisions of a Neutral Expert, that's matrix 2. By the
	22	respect to a specific plant does not prevent a Court of	22	conclusion of my presentation, I will have led you
	23	Arbitration from later reaching a different conclusion	23	through all of the salient elements of each of those
	24	with respect to the general interpretation or	24	matrices and I'll make some concluding remarks.
	25	application of the Treaty. In such a situation, it is	25	(Slide 11) So first of all, I'm going to address the
		Page 137		Page 139
			14.70	
14:55	1	the interpretation of the Court, not the earlier	14:58 1	"binding or otherwise controlling effect" of decisions
	2	interpretation of the Neutral Expert, which is binding	2	of a Court of Arbitration.
	3	for all future Indian plants on the Western Rivers.	3	Examining first then these Court of Arbitration
	4	So I now turn to the detail of Pakistan's response	4	decisions. As explained in our Memorial at
	5	to question (a).	5	paragraphs 8.62 to 8.69, the binding character on the
	6	The question, as we will see, is on the screen	6	parties of the decisions of a Court of Arbitration is
	7	again. We are on slide 10. It requires consideration	7	explicitly confirmed by the relevant paragraphs of
	8	of the binding or other controlling effects of four	8	Annexure G. And that is my next slide (12),
	9	types of Court of Arbitration decision, numbered (i) to	9	paragraphs 16 and 23.
	10	(iv) there; and four types of Neutral Expert decision	10	Paragraph 23 makes clear that any award rendered by
	11	too, the same categories. And it requires analysis of	11	a Court of Arbitration in accordance with the provisions
	12	those four types of decision across the two different	12	of Annexure G in regard to a dispute is "final and
	13	for a from four perspectives, and that's the perspectives	13	binding on the Parties with respect to that dispute".
	14	(a) to (d): the parties, the present proceedings, the	14	Now, what is a "dispute"? Under Article IX of the
	15	present proceedings before the Neutral Expert and future	15	Treaty, a "dispute" can arise out of:
	16	proceedings.	16	"Any question concerning the interpretation or
	17	So there's quite a few if you unpackage it	17	application of this Treaty or the existence of any fact
	18	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend	18	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this
	18 19	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend lots of time addressing all of them, because there is	18 19	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this Treaty"
	18 19 20	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend lots of time addressing all of them, because there is some overlap, but I am going to answer all of them.	18 19 20	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this Treaty" So on the face of Article IX, differences of
	18 19 20 21	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend lots of time addressing all of them, because there is some overlap, but I am going to answer all of them. But for your benefit and it's something that you	18 19 20 21	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this Treaty" So on the face of Article IX, differences of questions of fact, questions of interpretation,
	18 19 20 21 22	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend lots of time addressing all of them, because there is some overlap, but I am going to answer all of them. But for your benefit and it's something that you don't need to read in detail now, but I have prepared	18 19 20 21 22	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this Treaty" So on the face of Article IX, differences of questions of fact, questions of interpretation, application of the Treaty and of course competence are
	18 19 20 21 22 23	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend lots of time addressing all of them, because there is some overlap, but I am going to answer all of them. But for your benefit and it's something that you don't need to read in detail now, but I have prepared for you a matrix at the back of your handout; I think	18 19 20 21 22 23	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this Treaty" So on the face of Article IX, differences of questions of fact, questions of interpretation, application of the Treaty and of course competence are all capable of forming "disputes" for the purposes of
	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend lots of time addressing all of them, because there is some overlap, but I am going to answer all of them. But for your benefit and it's something that you don't need to read in detail now, but I have prepared for you a matrix at the back of your handout; I think it's tab 8. There's two matrices summarising Pakistan's	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this Treaty" So on the face of Article IX, differences of questions of fact, questions of interpretation, application of the Treaty and of course competence are all capable of forming "disputes" for the purposes of paragraph 23. Decisions of a Court of Arbitration on
	18 19 20 21 22 23	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend lots of time addressing all of them, because there is some overlap, but I am going to answer all of them. But for your benefit and it's something that you don't need to read in detail now, but I have prepared for you a matrix at the back of your handout; I think	18 19 20 21 22 23	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this Treaty" So on the face of Article IX, differences of questions of fact, questions of interpretation, application of the Treaty and of course competence are all capable of forming "disputes" for the purposes of
	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend lots of time addressing all of them, because there is some overlap, but I am going to answer all of them. But for your benefit and it's something that you don't need to read in detail now, but I have prepared for you a matrix at the back of your handout; I think it's tab 8. There's two matrices summarising Pakistan's answers on each of the 16 questions, effectively, that	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this Treaty" So on the face of Article IX, differences of questions of fact, questions of interpretation, application of the Treaty and of course competence are all capable of forming "disputes" for the purposes of paragraph 23. Decisions of a Court of Arbitration on all of those matters are therefore final and binding on
	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	quite a few questions there. And I'm not going to spend lots of time addressing all of them, because there is some overlap, but I am going to answer all of them. But for your benefit and it's something that you don't need to read in detail now, but I have prepared for you a matrix at the back of your handout; I think it's tab 8. There's two matrices summarising Pakistan's	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which, if established, might constitute a breach of this Treaty" So on the face of Article IX, differences of questions of fact, questions of interpretation, application of the Treaty and of course competence are all capable of forming "disputes" for the purposes of paragraph 23. Decisions of a Court of Arbitration on

15.00 1	dia maria	15.02 1	Audial IV
15:00 1	the parties.	15:03 1	Article IX.
2	As for decisions relating to competence,	2	This is the crux of res judicata. That doctrine, as
3	paragraph 16 of Annexure G there provides that:	3	Pakistan says in its Memorial at paragraph 8.70,
4	"Subject to the provisions of this Treaty and except	4 5	"precludes re-litigation of the same subject matter between the same parties in later proceedings".
5	as the parties may otherwise agree, the Court shall	5	
6	decide all questions relating to its competence"	6	Res judicata is a general principle of law and
7	Such decisions are made in the form of awards, like	7	this is my next slide (13) a general principle of law
8	this Court's Award on Competence dated 23 July last	8	applicable throughout international judicial
9	year, and are thus equally binding on the parties by	9	proceedings.
10	virtue of paragraph 23.	10	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Fietta, before you move on, if you could
11	As paragraph 23 makes clear, the formal requirements	11	go back to the prior slide (12). And if you plan to
12	of any "award" are simple: it must be in writing; it	12	address this later on, that's fine. But I'm wondering
13	must be accompanied by a statement of reasons; signed by	13	if you could say a few words about what constitutes the
14	four or more members of the Court; and delivered by the	14	award. The award could be the entire decision that's been
15	Court to each party in signed form.	15	The award could be the entire decision that's been
16	So these paragraphs are determinative as regards	16	rendered, from paragraph 1 through to the dispositif;
17	those parts of question (a) concerning the parties in	17	it could be just the dispositif. And this language at
18	relation to Courts of Arbitration. And this plainly	18	paragraph 23 that says, "The Award shall be accompanied
19	applies to any form of award, including an award on	19	by a statement of reasons" might be read to mean that
20	competence, a partial award, a final award, like those	20	the award is something like the dispositif, but not the
21	in Kishenganga, or any other award "on the issues in	21	reasons. And this seems relevant when we're then
22	dispute". And in fact, at paragraphs 123 and 189 of	22	thinking about the res judicata effect of the award.
23	last year's Competence Award, you explicitly confirmed	23	So if you have thoughts in that regard, I'd welcome
24	the binding nature of the Kishenganga awards on India	24	them.
25	and Pakistan as parties.	25	MR FIETTA: Yes.
	Page 141		Page 143
15:01 1	The binding quality of the Court's decisions more	15:04 1	So the award as a whole, is the easy part, I guess,
2	generally, including on subsequent Courts of Arbitration	2	so long as it's rendered in accordance with the
3	or Neutral Expert proceedings under the Treaty, follows	3	provisions of the annexure, "shall be final and
4	from a combination of the Court's broad competence to	4	binding". It's final and binding "with respect to [the]
5	resolve disputes under Article IX and paragraph 23 of	5	dispute". And the dispute can extend to disputes
6	Annexure G and the res judicata effect of its decisions	6	related to issues of fact, law, application of law and
7	as a matter of basic international law. As I'll explain	7	the Treaty to specific plants.
8	shortly, this was explicitly confirmed by the Court	8	So to the extent that the provisions in the award
9	and tacitly acknowledged even by India in the	9	
10	Kishenganga case.	10	
11	So this was again a tacit reference to go to your	11	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
12	question by India as regards the role of	12	
13	res judicata. But again, it was a tacit position;	13	• •
14	it wasn't explicit, as we will see.	14	
15	As a matter of plain meaning and object and purpose,	15	*
16	an award that's "final and binding" on the parties, and	16	
17	which thus finally "resolves" a dispute under the	17	
18	Treaty, must also be binding on other dispute resolution	18	within international law as to the extent of
19	mechanisms which may be seised of disputes or other	19	, ,
20	differences under the same Treaty, whether in parallel	20	1
21	or in future. Otherwise, the final and binding nature	21	v 1
22	of a Court's award, and the ability of a Court to	22	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
23	resolve the dispute, would be critically undermined,	23	<u> </u>
24	because the parties could circumvent an award simply by	24	*
25	engaging in fresh dispute resolution procedures under	25	The point on res judicata is more explicit in saying
	Page 142	l	Page 144
	•	1	

40 (Pages 141 to 144)

15:06 1	that to the extent necessary to understand the reasoning	15:09 1	the nature of the principle of res judicata.
2	behind the decision in the dispositif, then other parts	2	The award, back in 1941, indicated:
3	of an award can be treated as res judicata, and I'll be	3	"That the sanction of res judicata attaches to
4	taking you to the recent Colombia v Nicaragua decision	4	a final decision of an international tribunal is
5	in relation to that issue.	5	an essential and settled rule of international law.
6	THE CHAIRMAN: So you don't see any significance in the	6	'If it is true that international relations based on
7	wording here in paragraph 23 that, "The Award shall be	7	law and justice require arbitral or judicial
8	accompanied by a statement of reasons", rather than	8	adjudication of international disputes, it is equally
9	saying, "The Award shall include a statement of	9	true that such adjudication must, in principle, remain
10	reasons"?	10	unchallenged if it is to be effective to that end."
11	MR FIETTA: No. I think it would be overly artificial to	11	And even before Trail Smelter, of course, there were
12	indicate or to expect that an award under paragraph 23,	12	many other decisions that Trail Smelter cited, from
13	that the award proper would be limited to the two	13	previous jurisprudence from the Permanent Court of
14		14	International Justice and otherwise.
15	the rest is simply a statement of reasons which has no	15	So status of the principle in law is unshakable and
16	legal impact and no binding effect between the parties.	16	essentially unchallenged.
17	And I think that certainly would be inconsistent with	17	(Slide 14) As to the meaning of the doctrine of
18		18	res judicata, Bin Cheng cites back to the Société
19	that the underlying reasons themselves can form part of	19	commercial de Belgique case back in 1939:
20	the res judicata. Because otherwise, the final and	20	" [it] means nothing else than recognition of
21	binding effect of the decision itself will be put in	21	the fact that the terms of that award are definitive and
22	jeopardy.	22	obligatory."
23	So, for example, in your Award on Competence you	23	And in its pure sense, to go to your question,
24	reached a number of findings on fact in your underlying	24	res judicata in its purest sense applies to the
25	analysis: as regards the constitution of the Court, for	25	operative clause. But it certainly does not end at the
	Page 145		Page 147
15:07 1	We also discount that the second second	17.10 1	er i a ar er
	example. Your dispositif said that was in accordance with the Treaty. But the factual findings as to the way	15:10 1	operative clause, as I was saying, or the dispositif.
2 3	in which the Court had been constituted were also final	2	(Slide 15) And the ICJ looked at this point quite
4	and binding: they could not be challenged or reopened by	3 4	recently in the Delimitation of the Continental Shelf beyond 200 miles that's PLA-108, and the relevant
5	another attempt to refer the dispute to a third party	5	paragraphs are on your slide and it did so in order
6	under Article IX. If a party could have reopened those	6	to ascertain the meaning and scope of res judicata in
7	findings of fact in the main body of your Award on	7	the dispositif. It said (paragraph 59) that:
8	Competence, then the res judicata of your decision on	8	" it is also necessary to ascertain the content
9	competence would be fatally undermined, potentially.	9	of the decision, the finality of which is to be
10	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And again, you may be getting to	10	guaranteed."
11	this in due course. But I take it what you're saying	11	And the court continued by observing, in the
12	is: it's not just the dispositif; it does include	12	highlighted text (paragraph 61):
13	aspects of the reasoning underlying what is determined	13	" in order to ascertain what is covered by
14	in the dispositif. There may be other aspects of the	14	res judicata, it may be necessary to determine the
15	award that are not directly germane to the outcome that	15	meaning of the operative clause by reference to the
16	might not have res judicata effect. Is that the way	16	reasoning set out in the judgment in question."
17	you're seeing it?	17	And of course, in that case the court was faced with
18	MR FIETTA: That's correct. Yes, that is correct.	18	such a situation, because Nicaragua and Colombia
19	(Slide 13) So res judicata is a general principle of	19	disagreed fundamentally on the operative clause of the
20	law, as I was saying, applicable throughout	20	earlier decision in the case between them in 2012. And
21			•
	international judicial proceedings; confirmed by	21	therefore the court analysed the underlying rationale of
22	international judicial proceedings; confirmed by Bin Cheng, of course, in his seminal work (PLA-95),	22	that decision in the main body of the 2012 judgment in
22 23	international judicial proceedings; confirmed by Bin Cheng, of course, in his seminal work (PLA-95), which will be familiar to some members of the Court,	22 23	that decision in the main body of the 2012 judgment in order to assess whether or not the question before them
22 23 24	international judicial proceedings; confirmed by Bin Cheng, of course, in his seminal work (PLA-95), which will be familiar to some members of the Court, which appears on my slide. And he cites the no less	22 23 24	that decision in the main body of the 2012 judgment in order to assess whether or not the question before them in the new case was res judicata or not. And it
22 23	international judicial proceedings; confirmed by Bin Cheng, of course, in his seminal work (PLA-95), which will be familiar to some members of the Court,	22 23	that decision in the main body of the 2012 judgment in order to assess whether or not the question before them
22 23 24	international judicial proceedings; confirmed by Bin Cheng, of course, in his seminal work (PLA-95), which will be familiar to some members of the Court, which appears on my slide. And he cites the no less	22 23 24	that decision in the main body of the 2012 judgment in order to assess whether or not the question before them in the new case was res judicata or not. And it decided, having looked at the underlying rationale of
22 23 24	international judicial proceedings; confirmed by Bin Cheng, of course, in his seminal work (PLA-95), which will be familiar to some members of the Court, which appears on my slide. And he cites the no less seminal Trail Smelter award as one of many which confirm	22 23 24	that decision in the main body of the 2012 judgment in order to assess whether or not the question before them in the new case was res judicata or not. And it

,			
15:12 1	the decision in 2012, that the new case was not	15:15 1	As the Kishenganga Court acknowledged in its partial
2	res judicata.	2	award, "stability and predictability are vitally
3	(Slide 16) The ICJ has also explained the basic	3	important for the effective utilization of rights
4	rationale for res judicata. In the Bosnian Genocide	4	accorded to each Party by the Treaty". And that's
5	case, for example, PLA-109 (paragraph 116), the court	5	PLA-3, paragraph 457.
6	said:	6	Related doctrines of good faith are also relevant.
7	"The Court's function, according to Article 38 of	7	It's difficult to see how a Court of Arbitration or
8	its Statute, is to 'decide', that is, to bring to	8	a Neutral Expert could in good faith disregard the final
9	an end, 'such disputes as are submitted to it'	9	and binding decisions contained in the award of
10	Depriving a litigant of the benefit of a judgment it has	10	a previous Court of Arbitration.
11	already obtained must in general be seen as a breach of	11	Pakistan's submission on the binding quality of the
12	the principles governing the legal settlement of	12	Court's decisions, both in respect of plant-specific
13	disputes."	13	disputes and more generally with respect to Indian HEPs
14	The key word with reference to the statute there was	14	on the Western Rivers, is confirmed by a close
15	"decide". For your purpose, the key word is "resolve",	15	examination of the Kishenganga case. So we'll turn to
16	under the Indus Waters Treaty. And we say that the task	16	that now.
17	of resolving a dispute is directly analogous it's the	17	In that case, the Court addressed two threshold
18	same as the task of deciding a dispute at the ICJ	18	questions: namely, the legality under the Treaty of
19	under its statute.	19	a proposed diversion of the Kishenganga; and secondly,
20	Notably for purposes of question (a), in the	20	the permissibility under the Treaty of drawdown flushing
21	following paragraph, paragraph 117, the ICJ confirmed	21	at the Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers.
22	that the res judicata doctrine applied to questions of	22	On my next slide, slide 17, in its partial award and
23	competence or jurisdiction, just as it applied to	23	final award in relation to that first question,
24	questions of merit. (Pause)	24	diversion, the Court rejected the plant-specific
25	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Fietta, since you've paused, I'll jump in.	25	declaration requested by Pakistan and proceeded to make
	Page 149		Page 151
15:13 1	And this question may be one that's better addressed by	15:16 1	a series of decisions relating to the application of the
2	Professor Tanzi on Friday when he takes to the podium.	2	Treaty to the specific circumstances of the KHEP. And
3	But I'm curious if there are examples where the text	3	they are summarised on the slide here at paragraph A of
4	of a judgment or an award are cross-referenced in	4	the dispositif.
5	a dispositif in a way that that to some extent addresses	5	In relation to the second question that is,
6	this issue that we've been talking about, where it's	6	drawdown flushing the Court rendered a general
7	quite clear from the dispositif itself that there's	7	interpretative declaration, and it's clearly on its face
8	particular reasoning that is pertinent to that	8	a general declaration.
9	conclusion in the dispositif. If there are such	9	We can go to the next slide (18). That general
10	examples, I'd welcome Pakistan informing the Court about	10	declaration indicated that "the Treaty does not permit
11	them.	11	reduction below Dead Storage Level of the water level in
12	MR FIETTA: Yes, indeed. Professor Tanzi will be addressing	12	the reservoirs", except in cases of unforeseen
13	you on the narrative dispositif, and that would very	13	emergency, of course. And the Court proceeded to hold
14	much encapsulate such a technique, potentially, in the	14	that "the accumulation of sediment in the reservoir of
15	drafting of a dispositif. So I'm sure we will come back	15	a run-of-river plant on the Western Rivers" did not
16	to that later in the week.	16	constitute such an emergency.
17	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.	17	So that's dispositifs $B(1)$ and (2) . And the Court
18	MR FIETTA: In short, the recognition of judgments or awards	18	then proceeded at dispositif B(3) to issue
19	of competent international courts and tribunals as being	19	a plant-specific instruction to India on the back of
20	"definitive and obligatory", in the words of the PCIJ,	20	those generic holdings, namely not to employ drawdown
21	and thus res judicata, is essential for the	21	flushing at the reservoir of the KHEP to an extent that
22	effectiveness of adjudication and consequently for the	22	would entail depletion of the reservoir below dead
23	stability of international legal relations. It is no	23	storage level.
24	less essential to the system of adjudication under the	24	(Slide 19) The Court emphasised earlier in the
25	Indus Waters Treaty.	25	partial award that the scope of the second question
	D 150		D 152
	Page 150		Page 152
		Ī	

42 (Pages 149 to 152)

15:18 1 about drawdown flushing was general in nature, and that 2 its rulings would apply to future HEPs on the Western 3 Rivers. And you can see that in this quotation from 4 paragraph 466, for example, where the Court said that: 5 "The question facing the Court is therefore whether 6 the Treaty prohibits drawdown flushing by India at the 7 KHEP and at other, future Run-of-River Plants on the 8 Western Rivers." 9 The generic nature of the Court's decision on the 10 legality of drawdown flushing was emphasised repeatedly 11 in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for 12 clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. 13 Notably, this request was brought by India in the 14 Kishenganga case. 15 (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the 16 request indicated that: 17 "With respect to the scope of the question submitted 18 and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to 19 be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown 20 flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 21 In other words, it had been part of the dispute, and 21 Treaty, and it may be that it doepted a cknowledge the generic binding effect of the C acknowledge the generic binding effect of the C findings. It's only after it lost on this application that it adopted a different position and stepped a from that acknowledgement of the binding effect of the C findings. It's only after it lost on this application that it adopted a different position and stepped a from that acknowledgement of the binding effect of the C findings. It's only acknowledge the generic binding effect of the C findings. It's only acknowledge the generic binding effect of the C findings. It's only acknowledgement of the binding effect of the C findings. It's only acknowledgement of the binding effect of the C findings. It's only acknowledgement of the binding effect of the C that it adopted a different position and stepped a from that acknowledgement of the binding effect of the C Silde 2 (Slide 24) As we have seen, the Court was urter in that it a	way t of the moved by n. t, the ng n ue Western of the
Rivers. And you can see that in this quotation from paragraph 466, for example, where the Court said that: "The question facing the Court is therefore whether the Treaty prohibits drawdown flushing by India at the KHEP and at other, future Run-of-River Plants on the Western Rivers." The generic nature of the Court's decision on the legality of drawdown flushing was emphasised repeatedly in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to findings. It's only after it lost on this application that: (Kishenganga award beyond the KHEP. Kishenganga award beyond the KHEP. (Slide 24) As we have seen, the Court was ur Kishenganga award beyond the KHEP. Court emphasised again, as it had in its underly: partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par Treaty's essential bargain", and which would bin the when assessing sites for all future HEPs. With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing was put before the Court as a general issue."	way t of the moved by n. t, the ng n ue Western of the
4 paragraph 466, for example, where the Court said that: 5 "The question facing the Court is therefore whether 6 the Treaty prohibits drawdown flushing by India at the 7 KHEP and at other, future Run-of-River Plants on the 8 Western Rivers." 9 The generic nature of the Court's decision on the 10 legality of drawdown flushing was emphasised repeatedly 11 in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for 12 clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. 13 Notably, this request was brought by India in the 14 Kishenganga case. 15 (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the 16 request indicated that: 17 "With respect to the scope of the question submitted 18 paragraph 34 of its decision on India's request for 19 hat paragraph 34 of its decision on India's request for interpretation and clarification 20 construction or interpretation and stepped a from that acknowledgement of the binding effect for the binding effect from that acknowledgement of the binding effect for the binding effect for the court was urinding effect	way t of the moved by n. t, the ng n ee Western of the
The question facing the Court is therefore whether the Treaty prohibits drawdown flushing by India at the KHEP and at other, future Run-of-River Plants on the Western Rivers." The generic nature of the Court's decision on the legality of drawdown flushing was emphasised repeatedly in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 24) As we have seen, the Court was ur India's request for interpretation and clarification or interpretation on the request for la gainst drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the Rivers. It held that the prohibition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs and design of HEPs under the court was ur formula the Kishenganga award beyond the KHEP. (Slide 24) As we have seen, the Court was ur India's request for interpretation and clarification or interpretation on the request for interpretation and clarification or interpretation on India's request for interpretation and clarification or interpretation on India's request or interpretation and clarification or interpretation on India's request or interpretation and clarification or interpretation on India's request or interpretation or interpretation and clarification or interpretation on India's request or interpretation or interpretation on India's request or india's request or india's request or interpretation or interpre	t of the moved by n. t, the ng n ee Western of the
the Treaty prohibits drawdown flushing by India at the KHEP and at other, future Run-of-River Plants on the Western Rivers." The generic nature of the Court's decision on the legality of drawdown flushing was emphasised repeatedly in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 24) As we have seen, the Court was ur at India's request for interpretation and clarification Court emphasised again, as it had in its underly: against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the Rivers. It held that the prohibition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." Kishenganga award beyond the KHEP. (Slide 24) As we have seen, the Court was ur at India's request for interpretation and clarification Court emphasised again, as it had in its underly: partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sevent against drawdown flushing award, the generic nature of its prohibition against drawdown flushing award, the generic nature of its prohibi	moved by n. t, the ng on ne Western of the
KHEP and at other, future Run-of-River Plants on the Western Rivers." The generic nature of the Court's decision on the legality of drawdown flushing was emphasised repeatedly in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." (Slide 24) As we have seen, the Court was ur have legality of interpretation and clarification flushing request for interpretation; hat be decision on India's request flushing request for interpretation; hat be decision on the flushing request for interpretation; hat be decision on the flushing request for interpretation; hat be decision on the flushing request for interpretatio	n. t, the ng n e Western of the
Western Rivers." The generic nature of the Court's decision on the legality of drawdown flushing was emphasised repeatedly in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 8 India's request for interpretation and clarification 9 At paragraph 34 of its decision on India's request 10 Court emphasised again, as it had in its underly. 11 partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition 12 against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the sequence of the question on the 13 Rivers. It held that the prohibition constituted 14 a "regulatory consideration" which formed "parties essential bargain", and which would bim the sequence of the question submitted 15 Treaty's essential bargain", and which would bim the submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown 19 bargain" is one of the regulatory constraints on the parties, this Court as a general issue." 20 construction of HEPs and design of HEPs under	n. t, the ng n e Western of the
The generic nature of the Court's decision on the legality of drawdown flushing was emphasised repeatedly in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." At paragraph 34 of its decision on India's request Court emphasised again, as it had in its underly. Rout against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the Rivers. It held that the prohibition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par be beginned in the court is decision on India's request 10 Court emphasised again, as it had in its underly. It had in its underly. It had in its underly. It held that the penition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par be a "regulatory consideration" which would bin the court's subsequent decision on the request india HEPs on the subsequent of the prohibition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par be a "regulatory consideration" which so a point to which Sir Daniel took yo the flushing was point to which Sir Daniel took yo the flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." It hink, yesterday: the fact that this "essential bargain" is one of the regulatory constraints on the prohibition constituted the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition can be against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the subsequent of the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted th	t, the ng n e Western of the
legality of drawdown flushing was emphasised repeatedly in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 10 Court emphasised again, as it had in its underly partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition constituted against drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the partial award, the generic nature of its prohibition ca	ng on ne Western of the
in the Court's subsequent decision on the request for clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the Rivers. It held that the prohibition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par Treaty's essential bargain", and which would bit when assessing sites for all future HEPs. To this is a point to which Sir Daniel took yo I think, yesterday: the fact that this "essential be bargain" is one of the regulatory constraints on the flushing was put before the Court as a general issue."	ne Western of the
clarification or interpretation; that's PLA-21. Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the Rivers. It held that the prohibition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par be to the scope of the decision on the frequest indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs on the Rivers. It held that the prohibition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par be to the sesential bargain", and which would be the when assessing sites for all future HEPs. So this is a point to which Sir Daniel took yo to the fact that this "essential be bargain" is one of the regulatory constraints on the construction of HEPs and design of HEPs under	e Western of the
Notably, this request was brought by India in the Kishenganga case. (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." Rivers. It held that the prohibition constituted a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par 15 Treaty's essential bargain", and which would bim 16 when assessing sites for all future HEPs. So this is a point to which Sir Daniel took you 18 I think, yesterday: the fact that this "essential bargain" is one of the regulatory constraints on 19 bargain is one of the regulatory constraints on 19 construction of HEPs and design of HEPs under	of the
Kishenganga case. (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 14 a "regulatory consideration" which formed "par Treaty's essential bargain", and which would bit when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 15 Treaty's essential bargain", and which would bit when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 17 So this is a point to which Sir Daniel took you have been added to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown have been as general issue." 18 I think, yesterday: the fact that this "essential bargain", and which would be when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 19 bargain is one of the regulatory constraints on the paragraph 25 of the decision on the strength and which would be when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 19 bargain is one of the regulatory constraints on the paragraph 25 of the decision on the strength and which would be when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 19 bargain is one of the regulatory constraints on the paragraph 25 of the decision on the strength and which would be when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 19 bargain is one of the regulatory constraints on the paragraph 25 of the decision on the strength and which would be when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 19 bargain is one of the regulatory constraints on the paragraph 25 of the decision on the strength and which would be when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 20 construction of HEPs and design of HEPs under the paragraph 25 of the decision on the strength and the paragraph 25 of the decision of the paragraph 25 of the decision of the paragraph 25 of the decision of the paragraph 25 of the	
15 (Slide 21) Paragraph 25 of the decision on the 16 request indicated that: 17 "With respect to the scope of the question submitted 18 and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to 19 be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown 20 flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 15 Treaty's essential bargain", and which would be when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 17 So this is a point to which Sir Daniel took you have been added to be paragin is one of the regulatory constraints on the construction of HEPs and design of HEPs under	
request indicated that: "With respect to the scope of the question submitted and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 16 when assessing sites for all future HEPs. 17 So this is a point to which Sir Daniel took yo 18 I think, yesterday: the fact that this "essential 19 bargain" is one of the regulatory constraints on the standard design of HEPs under	id India
17 "With respect to the scope of the question submitted 18 and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to 19 be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown 20 flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 17 So this is a point to which Sir Daniel took yo 18 I think, yesterday: the fact that this "essential 19 bargain" is one of the regulatory constraints on the construction of HEPs and design of HEPs under	
and discussed by the Parties, this Court considers it to 18 I think, yesterday: the fact that this "essential 19 be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown 20 flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 18 I think, yesterday: the fact that this "essential 19 bargain" is one of the regulatory constraints on 20 construction of HEPs and design of HEPs under	
be beyond doubt that the permissibility of drawdown 19 bargain" is one of the regulatory constraints on 20 flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 20 construction of HEPs and design of HEPs under	1,
20 flushing was put before the Court as a general issue." 20 construction of HEPs and design of HEPs under	
L 21 In Older Words. It had been part of the dispute and L 21 treaty and it may be that it does brechide mala	
general dispute. 23 to choose others where drawdown flushing is not 24 And at paragraph 27, the next slide (22): 24 required. But the prohibition under the Treaty is	
24 And at paragraph 27, the next side (22). 24 required. But the promotion under the freaty from the Second Dispute with a question of 25 clear, and the generic effect of the Kishenganga	
25 Paced in the Second Dispute with a question of 25 clear, and the generic effect of the Kishenganga	5
Page 153 Page 155	
15:19 1 interpretation centred on the general meaning and 15:23 1 award's decision on that prohibition was emp	haciced
2 application of a particular provision and its 2 again in this decision on clarification/interpretation of a particular provision and its	
3 relationship with the Treaty as a whole, the Court's 3 It's notable that these passages refer through	
4 answer to it was general as well and not limited to the 4 the binding nature of the Court's decision acr	
5 KHEP The inclusion of such an express 5 as a whole. In effect, therefore, the Court's d	-
6 limitation" 6 was to be binding both as regards the parties	
7 Well, I'll come to that point actually, the express 7 regards future Neutral Expert or Court process	edings.
8 limitation point, in a second. 8 Otherwise, the Court's operative decision with	h respect
9 India itself acknowledged the generic nature of the 9 to the prohibition against drawdown flushing	under the
10 Court's decision in Kishenganga as regards the legality 10 Treaty would have been deprived of any res	udicata
of drawdown flushing. As we can see on my next slide 11 effect.	
12 (23), in its request for clarification or interpretation 12 Turning back to the partial award dispositi	
of the partial award on 18 May 2013 (P-548), India 13 I'm going to take you to a question of except	on and
explained that its application was motivated by the fact 14 limitation, which is a separate part of your	
that the partial award had set out a general prohibition 15 question (a): to what extent are there exception	
against the use of "drawdown flushing for sediment" 16 limitations to the final and binding effect of of	
17 control in all future Run-of-River plants". This is 17 of a Court of Arbitration? And the Kishenga	nga partial
18 from India's own application. 18 award is illustrative on this point.	
19 India thus requested clarification or interpretation 19 (Slide 25) It concerns the fourth paragraph	
in an attempt to preserve an ability to reduce water 20 dispositif in the Court's award (PLA-3), high	-
21 levels below dead storage during drawdown flushing at 21 here. And it's an exception to the general bir	-
22 other Western Rivers sites in the future. That's clear 22 effect of the Kishenganga Court's rulings wit	_
from paragraph 3 of the Indian application. And that's 23 to the issues before them, namely that those	-
perhaps, on the record that we have, the clearest 24 would not apply to Indian HEPs on the West	TOTAL
	unis
perhaps, on the record that we have, the clearest 24 would not apply to Indian HEPs on the West	unis

43 (Pages 153 to 156)

15:24	1 Partial Award". So the prohibition on drawdown flushin		clear that except where so limited the Court's
	would not apply to Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers	2	Decision applies to Run-of-River Plants generally."
	3 that were in operation already on the date of issuance	3	There's some more context about that aspect of the
	4 of this partial award, or that were already under	4	decision at paragraph 523 (PLA-3), on my next slide
	5 construction as at that date, "the design of which,	5	(27):
	6 having been duly communicated by India had not been	6	"It would not be in accordance with the governing
	7 objected to by Pakistan" under Annexure D.	7	principles enunciated in this Partial Award for the
	8 This was the first of two limitations or exceptions	8	interpretation of the Treaty, and its application, to
	9 to the res judicata nature of the Court's awards in	9	cast doubt retrospectively on Plants already in
	10 Kishenganga. And this important proviso to the systemic		operation"
	11 interpretation on drawdown flushing was sound from	11	So you can see the rationale for that limitation
	12 a legal perspective, not least in recognising the	12	there.
	res judicata effect of the earlier Baglihar decision for	13	I've spent some time addressing the question of
	14 the Baglihar HEP. It was also essential from	14	permissibility of drawdown flushing at Indian HEPs
	a practical perspective, because any retrospective	15	because it's the most notable exercise, perhaps, by the
	application of the decision would have had enormous	16	Kishenganga Court of a generic interpretative exercise
	adverse consequences for India, of course, with respect	17	and the exercise of that competence under the Treaty.
	to other HEPs already in operation by the time of the	18	Moreover, that general interpretative competence was
	19 Kishenganga award.	19	exercised against the backdrop of a contrary decision of
	20 So this proviso at paragraph B(4) goes directly to	20	the Neutral Expert, of course, and in a context where
	your question about exceptions and limitations. That	21	India itself acknowledged the general interpretative
	is, Courts of Arbitration, in rendering systemic	22	competence of a Court of Arbitration in the context of
	interpretations, should be mindful of the res judicata	23	its request for interpretation, as compared with the
	24 effect of previous final and binding decisions,	24	plant-specific competence of a Neutral Expert on the
	25 including of Neutral Experts, with respect to specific	25	same question.
	Page 157		Page 159
15:26	•	15:29 1	So as such, the history related to the question of
	2 retrospectively on those Indian run-of-river plants that	2	drawdown flushing is of great assistance, we say, to the
	are already in operation on the Western Rivers.	3	Court's question (a), both as regards the general
	4 THE CHAIRMAN: It may be a fine point Mr Fietta, but is this		interpretative competence exercised by the Court under
	5 really an exception to res judicata effect, as opposed	5	the Treaty in that case and as regards the more limited
	to the Court reaching a judgment that excluded certain	6	interpretative competence of Neutral Experts, to which
	7 matters, and the res judicata then is that it reaches 8 some matters and not others?	7	I will return shortly.
		8 9	Now, aside from the issue of drawdown flushing, the
1	9 MR FIETTA: Yes, I think there is a discussion to be had 10 around that issue. As regards the generic	10	Kishenganga Court made a series of other important and
	interpretation and the final and binding effect of the	10	binding interpretative decisions. (Slide 28) These included, first of all, with
	12 drawdown flushing holding, it was an exception; but it	11	respect to the duty of Courts of Arbitration to
	was an explicit exception or limitation to that generic	13	interpret and apply the Treaty in light of rules and
	holding, which itself formed part of the dispositif, and	14	principles of international law; a duty which would be,
	therefore is res judicata. So, yes, I take the point.	15	of course, both unrealistic and inappropriate for
	16 Of course, paragraph B(4) was only required because	16	a Neutral Expert engineer when deciding a plant-specific
	the Court's interpretative holdings under B(1) and B(2)	17	issue. That's at paragraph 452. And therefore the
	1	18	
	that we saw earlier were otherwise of general	10	Court said it was incumbent on it to interpret and apply
1	 that we saw earlier were otherwise of general application. And the Court recognised this in its 		Court said it was incumbent on it to interpret and apply the Treaty in light of those customary international law
		19 20	the Treaty in light of those customary international law
2	19 application. And the Court recognised this in its	19	
2	 application. And the Court recognised this in its subsequent decision on clarification or interpretation 	19 20	the Treaty in light of those customary international law principles.
2 2 2	 application. And the Court recognised this in its subsequent decision on clarification or interpretation in the passage that we saw a moment ago. (Pause) 	19 20 21	the Treaty in light of those customary international law principles. This is obviously with reference also to
2 2 2	application. And the Court recognised this in its subsequent decision on clarification or interpretation in the passage that we saw a moment ago. (Pause) (Slide 26) Yes, and then there's reference to B(4)	19 20 21 22	the Treaty in light of those customary international law principles. This is obviously with reference also to paragraph 29 of Annexure G, of which there is no
2 2 2 2	application. And the Court recognised this in its subsequent decision on clarification or interpretation in the passage that we saw a moment ago. (Pause) (Slide 26) Yes, and then there's reference to B(4) that we just looked at. This was in the subsequent	19 20 21 22 23	the Treaty in light of those customary international law principles. This is obviously with reference also to paragraph 29 of Annexure G, of which there is no equivalent, of course, in Annexure F, relating to
2 2 2 2	application. And the Court recognised this in its subsequent decision on clarification or interpretation in the passage that we saw a moment ago. (Pause) (Slide 26) Yes, and then there's reference to B(4) that we just looked at. This was in the subsequent decision on interpretation (PLA-21): "The inclusion of such an express limitation makes	19 20 21 22 23 24	the Treaty in light of those customary international law principles. This is obviously with reference also to paragraph 29 of Annexure G, of which there is no equivalent, of course, in Annexure F, relating to Neutral Experts. (Slide 29) The Court also made definitive findings
2 2 2 2	application. And the Court recognised this in its subsequent decision on clarification or interpretation in the passage that we saw a moment ago. (Pause) (Slide 26) Yes, and then there's reference to B(4) that we just looked at. This was in the subsequent decision on interpretation (PLA-21):	19 20 21 22 23 24	the Treaty in light of those customary international law principles. This is obviously with reference also to paragraph 29 of Annexure G, of which there is no equivalent, of course, in Annexure F, relating to Neutral Experts.

44 (Pages 157 to 160)

			1.50	
15:31	1	in relation to the let-flow obligation and the division	15:34 1	Now, unsurprisingly, given the overriding importance
	2	of the six main watercourses under the Treaty as	2	of stability and predictability under the Treaty, and
	3	a "defining characteristic of the Treaty", and in that	3	the otherwise binding nature of Court of Arbitration
	4	context that: " Pakistan is given priority in the use of the	4 5	decisions, the Court set a high threshold for any such reconsideration in the future: "reasoning [that] no
	5 6	waters of the Western Rivers, just as India has priority	6	longer accords with reality". So the reasoning of the
	7	in the use of the Eastern Rivers."	7	decision must no longer really make sense in the new
	8	(Slide 30) And importantly, given the Court's	8	circumstances.
	9	question (a), it made an interpretative holding that	9	Although it's difficult to anticipate exactly when
	10	only awards of a Court of Arbitration have general	10	
	11	binding effect under the Treaty, in contrast with the	11	
	12	technical plant-specific determinations of a Neutral	12	
	13	Expert. That's paragraph 470. And I think this is	13	
	14	a good example of where the rationale underpinning the	14	
	15	Court's generic holding on drawdown flushing and its	15	
	16	explicit overruling, effectively, moving forward, of the	16	
	17	Baglihar decision is explained through the reasoning of	17	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	18	the award and forms a part, we would say, of the	18	
	19	res judicata of the award.	19	
	20	(Slide 31) The Kishenganga final award also	20	
	21	reiterated the pertinence of the principle of	21	
	22	res judicata. You'll recall the Court was devoted	22	
	23	largely to setting minimum flows in its final award at	23	
	24	the Kishenganga/Neelum River, to be released during the	24	
	25	operation of the KHEP.	25	•
				Î Î
		Page 161		Page 163
15:32	1	Between paragraphs 117 and 119 of the final award,	15:35 1	here.
	2	the Court noted the importance of res judicata under the	2	In other words, certainly in this particular
	3	Treaty in ensuring "stability and predictability".	3	context, the Court said, "We think that there may be
	4	However, the Court went on to say that future flows	4	reasons why our award may need to be changed, and we're
	5	upstream may come to differ significantly from the	5	going to put a time limit on that". But is it also
	6	historic record as a result of factors beyond the	6	possible that there's a recognition here that
	7	control of oither newty. The Court therefore		
		control of either party. The Court therefore	7	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances,
	8	proactively put in place a mechanism for future	8	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with
	8 9	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in	8 9	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to
	8 9 10	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no	8 9 10	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the
	8 9 10 11	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the	8 9 10 11	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that
	8 9 10 11 12	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum".	8 9 10 11 12	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata.
	8 9 10 11 12 13	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception	8 9 10 11 12 13	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata	8 9 10 11 12 13	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage,
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course.
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to res judicata or actually part of the res judicata and	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course. But the Court, in that passage where it said that it
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to res judicata or actually part of the res judicata and a limitation on the general binding effect. That was	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course. But the Court, in that passage where it said that it "considers it important not to permit the doctrine of
•	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to res judicata or actually part of the res judicata and a limitation on the general binding effect. That was the first exception or limitation: it would not be	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course. But the Court, in that passage where it said that it "considers it important not to permit the doctrine of res judicata to extend [where] reasoning no longer
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to res judicata or actually part of the res judicata and a limitation on the general binding effect. That was the first exception or limitation: it would not be retroactive. And secondly, here, this is a more	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course. But the Court, in that passage where it said that it "considers it important not to permit the doctrine of res judicata to extend [where] reasoning no longer accords with reality", that high threshold, it was
	8 9 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to res judicata or actually part of the res judicata and a limitation on the general binding effect. That was the first exception or limitation: it would not be retroactive. And secondly, here, this is a more forward-looking limitation or exception, designed to	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course. But the Court, in that passage where it said that it "considers it important not to permit the doctrine of res judicata to extend [where] reasoning no longer accords with reality", that high threshold, it was explicitly against the context in the previous paragraph
	8 9 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222 223	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to res judicata or actually part of the res judicata and a limitation on the general binding effect. That was the first exception or limitation: it would not be retroactive. And secondly, here, this is a more forward-looking limitation or exception, designed to allow for an amended application of the Treaty in the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course. But the Court, in that passage where it said that it "considers it important not to permit the doctrine of res judicata to extend [where] reasoning no longer accords with reality", that high threshold, it was explicitly against the context in the previous paragraph of such a change in circumstances whereby the reasoning
	8 9 10 111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to res judicata or actually part of the res judicata and a limitation on the general binding effect. That was the first exception or limitation: it would not be retroactive. And secondly, here, this is a more forward-looking limitation or exception, designed to allow for an amended application of the Treaty in the event of uncontrollable but significant changes in	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course. But the Court, in that passage where it said that it "considers it important not to permit the doctrine of res judicata to extend [where] reasoning no longer accords with reality", that high threshold, it was explicitly against the context in the previous paragraph of such a change in circumstances whereby the reasoning no longer accords with reality "as a result of factors
	8 9 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222 223	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to res judicata or actually part of the res judicata and a limitation on the general binding effect. That was the first exception or limitation: it would not be retroactive. And secondly, here, this is a more forward-looking limitation or exception, designed to allow for an amended application of the Treaty in the event of uncontrollable but significant changes in circumstances.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course. But the Court, in that passage where it said that it "considers it important not to permit the doctrine of res judicata to extend [where] reasoning no longer accords with reality", that high threshold, it was explicitly against the context in the previous paragraph of such a change in circumstances whereby the reasoning no longer accords with reality "as a result of factors beyond the control of either Party, including climate
	8 9 10 111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	proactively put in place a mechanism for future reconsideration of its decision on the minimum flow in the event that, as the Court put it, "its reasoning no longer accords with reality along the Kishenganga/Neelum". This was perhaps a second limitation or exception identified by the Court to the otherwise res judicata effect of its awards. The first limitation or exception, as we saw before, prevented retroactive application, whether it's formally an exception to res judicata or actually part of the res judicata and a limitation on the general binding effect. That was the first exception or limitation: it would not be retroactive. And secondly, here, this is a more forward-looking limitation or exception, designed to allow for an amended application of the Treaty in the event of uncontrollable but significant changes in	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	res judicata should not apply in other circumstances, where the reasoning of the award does not accord with reality over time, including with respect possibly to climate change or other factors? Because if that's the case, it seems like a rather important exception that you're identifying with respect to res judicata. MR FIETTA: Yes. Well, I think my answer for now would be really to focus on what the Court says in this passage, which does go, to an extent, to the broader issues that you've raised pertinently in your question. And it's a point to which we can return, of course. But the Court, in that passage where it said that it "considers it important not to permit the doctrine of res judicata to extend [where] reasoning no longer accords with reality", that high threshold, it was explicitly against the context in the previous paragraph of such a change in circumstances whereby the reasoning no longer accords with reality "as a result of factors

45 (Pages 161 to 164)

2 there, and had been mentioned in the control of minimum 3 flow; not in the control, of course, of drandform 4 flushing and the other part of the decision. 5 This was limited to the minimum flow, the 9 cusess 6 part of the decision where the Court believed that that 7 may need to be reviewed in future as a result of may 8 dramatic changes in circumstances specific to that plant 9 and that river. I don't think you can read this 10 decision more broadly in connection with climate change 11 being a potential basis to reopen rea judicula 12 generally. I think it was very specific to a specific 13 simulation addressed around this minimum flow issue, and 14 for now I certainly would not read more into it. 15 THE CHAIRMAN I men, it's vertainly and interesting 16 approach, in that one could imagine writing 17 paragraphs 117 to 119 simply to say that, "For the next 18 seven years, in the event that there are changes of some 18 kind that relate to this issue, either party was present. 20 to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow my return 20 to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 21 judgment" as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow in freed when 23 there is a change in circumstances". 24 Ill mudestand what you've saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 26 pours the door to a broader position is certainly that 3 it manufacts along the control of the decision on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on the interminant low if these between on the five and the low on the river, an ability to reconsideration. 27 of course, that has not happend. There has been no such darmanic change in circumstances hepond the control of the river and the low on the river, an ability to reconsideration. 28 a fundamental change on the specific river and the low on the river, an ability to reconsideration. 29 creation of	15:37	1	change", which was certainly in the minds of the Court	15:40 1	parties can reopen the decree in light of changed
international law that would apply? 4 Rushing and the other part of the decision. 5 This was limited to the minimum flow, the 9 cuses of part of the decision, where the Court hellved that that may need to be reviewed in future as a result of any armatic changes in circumstances specific to that plant and that river. I don't think you can result of any and that river. I don't think you can result of any and that river. I don't think you can result of any and that river. I don't think you can result of any and the river and the part of the decision more broadly in connection with climate change help a potential basis to reopen resimilar flow is a specific state of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word. But certainly that is not a possibility, when an equitable decrease of the country of the part of the word. I word of the country of the part of the word of the country of the part of the word. But certainly that it was very guest in the vert that there are changes of some part of the country of the part of the word. But certainly that it was the part of the word of the country of the part of the word. But certainly that it was the part of the word of the minimum flow if these factors of the part of the word of the part of the country of the part of the part of the word of the part of the word of the part of the part of the part of the word of the part of the part of the part of the part of the word of the part	13.37		·		
4 fileshing and the other part of the decision. 5 This was limited to the minimum flow, the 9 cusees. 6 part of the decision, where the Court believed that that may need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any any need to be reviewed in fature as a result of any and that read to thin the cimum than the control of a substance and that read to thin diminer than the need to a specific and that read to thin save every sears, in the event that there are changes of some kind that relate to this save, either party any return and the review of the need to make a control of the minimum thor visue any need to be reviewed in fature and the court of a summary of the need to make a control of the need to make any the need to make a control of the need to make any the need to make a control of the need to make any the need to make a control of the need to make any the need to make a control of the need to make any the need to make a control of the need to make any the need to make					
5 This was limited to the minimum flow, the 9 cusses part of the decision, where the Court believed that that may need to be reviewed in future as a result of any a dramatic changes in circumstances specific to that plant and that river. I don't think you can read this 10 decision more broadly in connection with climate change being a potential basis to reopen residucta as a fundamental change with the part of the Court for expectation addressed around this minimum flow issue, and for now I certainly would not read more into it. 15 THE CHARRAN: T mean, it's certainly an interesting approach, in that one could imagine writing paragraphs 117 to 119 simply to say that. Tort the next serve years, in the vent that there are changes of some 19 kind that relate to this issue, either party may return 20 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to revisitive consider this particular 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a broader potential effect on 2 to the Court to a br					
6 part of the decision, where the Court believed that that 7 may need to be reviewed in future as a result of any 8 dramatic changes in circumstances, specific to that plant 9 and that river. I don't think you can read this 10 decision more broadly in connection with themate change 11 being a potential basis to reopen res judicata 12 generally. I think it was very specific to a specific 13 situation addressed around this minimum flow issue, and 14 for now I certainly would not read more into it. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, it's certainly an interesting 16 approach, in that one could imagine writing 17 paragraphs IT to IT obsimply to say that, Tor the next 18 seeven years, in the event that there are changes of some 19 kind that relate to this issue, cither party was return 20 to the Court to revisit/recunsider this particular 21 judgment, as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when 23 there is a change in circumstances." 24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 26 pens the door to a broader potential effect on 27 res judicata. 28 A fraction, before on a broader potential effect on 29 respudically. I think this was designed to protect Raistan, 31 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 31 and for pens the door to a broader relevance or 32 recruit that is a second or the intermediation of the minimum flow it sheet factors outside the control of the minimum flow itsee factors outside the control of the pury. 31 certainty don't think — and the Court was nox 32 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of every normal law, partial and provide the control of either pury. 32 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 33 terms. 34 MRINEAR: I have been a depared. These has been no on the river, and this was designed to protect Raistan, the control of either pury. 34 MRINEAR: The language free is strikingly sind to a depart of the partial particular of the purpose of the			*		•
8 demantic changes in circumstances specific to that plant and that river. I don't think you can read this and that river. I don't think you can read this 10 decision more broadly in connection with climate change to be introduced and that river. I don't think you can read this 12 generally. I think it was very specific to a specific situation addressed around this minimum of the state of the around a special state of the agent of					
8 desplicit provision along those lines in its final award. 9 and that river. I don't think you can read this 10 decision more broadly in connection with climate change 11 being a potential basis to reopen res judicata 12 generally. I think it was very specific to a specific 13 situation addressed around this minimum flow issue, and 14 for now! Certainly would not read more into it. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, it's certainly an interesting 16 approach, in that one could imagine writing 17 paragraphs. 117 to 119 simply to say that, "For the next 18 seven years, in the event that there are changes of some 19 kind that relate to this issue, either party many return 20 to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 The doctrine of res judicata is southown affected when 23 there is a change in circumstances*. 24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 26 reseption to res judicata is southown affected when 27 the doctrine of resepondence of the court of a broader relevance or 28 resplicable are provision. It close refor to the possibility, when necessary, of applying treaties and applying customary international law. 29 and that relate to the sort of the about the flow on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on the river, and think or position is certainly that of the river, and think or position is certainly that of the river, and think or position is certainly that of the river, and the courts of the party. 25 I certainly don't think — and the Court was not to the river, and the court of a cither party. 26 I certainly don't think — and the Court was not to the river, and they not reconsider the decision on the river, and they not reconsider the decision on the river, and think or position is certainly that it is certainly					-
9 and that river. I don't think you can road this being a potential basis to reopen res judicata to generally. I think it was very specific to a specific situation addressed around this minimum flow issue, and 14 for now I certainly would not road more into it. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, it's certainly an interesting approach, in that one could imagine writing paragraphs 117 to 119 simply to say that, "For the next seev years, in the event that there are changes of some kind that relate to this issue, either party may return 20 to the Court to revisit/recensider this particular 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when the court is a change in circumstances." 24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 24 revented the revision of the court to revisition and the court was not 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of the party. I certainly don't think — and the Court was not 16 here intending to say — that climate change more be older to a pay— that climate change more of the party should accessitate such a reconsideration. 11 certainly don't think — and the Court was not 12 of oriented that pay to the factors outside the control of the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 15 here intending to say — that climate change more 16 here the party. 16 here are consideration 17 be broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 22 of environmental flow, that the Court was not 18 here the control of 24 here are the control of 25 here intending to say — that climate change more 26 here and the flow on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 18 here inte					
10 decision more broadly in connection with climate change let being a potential basis to reopen res judicata a generally. I think it was very specific to a specific of one of certainly would not read more into it. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, it's certainly an interesting approach, in that one could imagine writing paragraphs 117 to 119 simply to say that, "For the next seven years, in the event that there are changes of some kind that relate to this issue, either party may return 20 to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when 22 three is a change in circumstances". 24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it argushly Page 165 25 exception to res judicata based on climate change more broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of either party. 26 either party should no cessitiat such a reconsideration. 27 I certainly don't think — and the Court was not 15 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and first rules 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of either party. 28 I certainly don't think — and the Court was not 15 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and first rules 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of either party. 29 desewher in the award, in connection with the concept of either party should not explicitly in the provision of this internation of the court of a deriver and being nature of Court of Arbitration awards under the Treaty is dealt with elsewhere, and the limite of understand the provision with the concept of either party. 20 elsewhere in the award					
11 being a potential basis to roopen res judicuta 12 generally. I think it was very specific to a specific 13 situation addressed around this minimum flow issue, and 14 for now I certainly would not read more into it. 15 THE (CHAIRMAN: I mean, it's certainly an interesting 16 approach, in that one could imagine writing 17 paragraphs 1170 t19 simply to say that, "For the next 18 seven years, in the event that there are changes of some 19 kind that relate to this issue, either party may return 20 to to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 The doctrine of res judicate is somehow affected when 23 there is a change in circumstances' 24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 26 Page 165 15:39 1 opens the door to a broader potential effect on 27 res judicata. 3 MR FIETTA: Whe limited in this particular of the party should not open the door to a broader relevance or 3 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 4 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 5 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 6 broadly, if think it was designed to protace Plakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 10 the minimum flow if these factors ouside the control of 11 either party should an excensition such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of 14 production of HZPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in conmon law jurisdictions, it's commorplace, 21 terms. 22 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commorplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the					
12 generally. I think it was very specific to a specific status and dressed around this minimum flow issue, and for now I certainly would not read more into it. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, it's certainly an interesting approach, in that one could imagine writing to the paragraphs 117 to 119 simply to say that, "For the next seven years, in the event that there are changes of some in the foot to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular in the foot to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular in the foot to it is sue, either party may return to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular in the foot for fore judicata is somehow affected when there is a change in circumstances." 21 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 125 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 22 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 125 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 23 I opens the door to a broader potential effect on res judicant. 24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 15 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 25 I one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 125 go on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 125 go on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 125 go on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 125 go on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 125 go on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 125 go on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 125 go on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 125 go on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as 15:42 1 one might					-
13 situation addressed around this minimum flow issue, and 14 for now I certainly would not read more into it. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, it's certainly an interesting approach, in that one could imagine writing 16 approach, in that one could imagine writing 17 paragraphs 117 to 19 simply to say that, "For the next 18 seven years, in the event that there are changes of some 18 seven years, in the event that there are changes of some 19 kind that relate to this issue, either party may return 19 to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 20 to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 The doctrine of res judicatal is somehow affected when 23 there is a change in circumstances". 24 Indeed and the particular 25 limited in this particular 26 res judicata. 25 limited in this particular 26 res judicata. 3 MR FIETITA: Well, I think our position is certainly that 26 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 27 exception to res judicatal based on climate change more 28 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 29 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 29 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 21 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 29 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 29 the reintending to say — that climate change more 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 20 of environmental flow, that the Court was word under the Treaty 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 20 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 21 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 24 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 25 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 25 to indicate				12	-
14 for now I certainly would not read more into it. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, it's certainly an interesting approach, in that one could imagine writing approach, in that one working it that one of the court of approach, in that one working it was writing to the court of a Arbitration, before you move on to the Neutral Expert. 15		13		13	MR FIETTA: It may be that Judge Schwebel, who was president
16 approach, in that one could imagine writing 17 paragraphs 117 to 119 simply to say that, For the next 18 seven years, in the event that there are changes of some 19 kind that relate to this issue, either party may return 10 to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 20 to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when there is a change in circumstances". 23 to there is a change in circumstances. 24		14		14	of that Court, had those US rules in mind when writing
16 approach, in that one could imagine writing 17 paragraphs 117 to 119 simply to say that, "For the next seven years, in the event that there are changes of some 18 THE CHAIRMAN: Two smaller questions relating to Courts of Arbitration, before you move on to the Neutral Expert, 20 if that's okay. 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicitat is somehow affected when there is a change in circumstances". 23 The doctrine of res judicitat is somehow affected when there is a change in circumstances." 24 Tunderstand what you've saying, that you see it as 25 Ilmited in this particular context. But it arguably Page 165 Page 165 Page 167 Pa		15	THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, it's certainly an interesting	15	this part of the award. But certainly that's not
18 seven years, in the event that there are changes of some 19 kind that relate to this issue, either party may return 20 to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when there is a change in circumstances". 24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 26 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 27 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 28 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 29 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 29 limited in this particular context as 20 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 29 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 20 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 20 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 21 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 22 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 24 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 26 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 27 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 28 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 29 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 29 limited in this particular context is a papel in the same and papel in the content of 20 limited in this particular context on 21 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 29 limited in this particular context is an applying customary international law. It does not then applying customary international law. It does not then 22 limited in this particular context is applying customary international law. It does not then 22 limited in this particular context is applying customary international law. It does not then 22 limited in this particular context is applying customary international law. It does not then 22 lim		16		16	a canon of international law.
19 kind that relate to this issue, either party may return 20 to the Court to revisitoreconsider this particular 21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when 23 there is a change in circumstances". 23 page 165 24		17	paragraphs 117 to 119 simply to say that, "For the next	17	MR MINEAR: Thank you.
to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular programment, as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when there is a change in circumstances". I understand what you're saying, that you see it as limited in this particular context. But it arguably Page 165 Page 167 15:39 1 opens the door to a broader potential effect on espidicata. MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that it would not open the door to a broader relevance or exception to res judicata based on climate change more broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, primarily, in the event that, as a result of a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of either party. I certainly don't think – and the Court was not for here intending to say — that climate change more broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful terms. i there is a change in circumstances. i the is a change in circumstances. i there is a change in circumstances. i there is a change in circumstances. I the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of either party. I certainly don't think – and the Court was not of the minimum flow if the concept of environmental flow, that the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful terms. I think it mak		18	seven years, in the event that there are changes of some	18	THE CHAIRMAN: Two smaller questions relating to Courts of
21 judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that, 22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when 23 there is a change in circumstances". 24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 26 Page 165 27 Page 167 28 Page 167 29 poens the door to a broader potential effect on 2 res judicata. 3 MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that 4 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of either party. 11 Certainly don't think — and the Court was not 12 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 13 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 14 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 15 dealt with elsewhere, and the limited final and broader relevance or 26 production of the wind operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 27 dealth where it has not happened. There has been no 28 product the limits of that principle in similar 29 clienter party. 20 clienter party. 21 In think this woo points. 22 dealt with elsewhere, and the limited final and broader relevance or 23 prossibility, when necessary, of applying treates and applying customary international law. It does not then gops on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as 24 page 167 25 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 2 ICJ Statute. I'm wondering if we should draw any significance from that for the purposes that you were discussing. 3 on the river, an ability to reconsider relevance or 4 discussing. 4 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the 2 ICJ Statute. I'm wondering the we hould are a varied and the treaty elsewhere, as you've a discussing. 5 One thought,		19	kind that relate to this issue, either party may return	19	Arbitration, before you move on to the Neutral Expert,
22 "The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when there is a change in circumstances". 23 there is a change in circumstances. 24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably 25 Page 165 Page 165 Page 165 Page 167 15:39 1 opens the door to a broader potential effect on res judicata. 3 MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that it would not open the door to a broader relevance or exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 21 cither party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of either party. 15 Certainly don't think — and the Court was not 16 here intending to say — that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 20 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 such, and provide that the 25 such, directly. But of course those decisions do come		20	to the Court to revisit/reconsider this particular	20	if that's okay.
there is a change in circumstances". I understand what you're saying, that you see it as limited in this particular context. But it arguably Page 165 Page 167 15:39 1 opens the door to a broader potential effect on res judicata. MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that it would not open the door to a broader relevance or exception to res judicata based on climate change more broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, primarily, in the event that, as a result of a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of either party. Of course, that has not happened. There has been no such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of either party. I certainly don't think and the Court was not her intending to say that climate change more broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules est under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. 23 there is a change in circumstances of applying treaties and applying customary international alaw. It does not then go no to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as Page 167 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the ICJ Statute. I'm wondering if we should draw any significance from that for the purposes that you were discussing. 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the ICJ Statute. I'm wondering if we should draw any significance from that for the purposes that you were discussing. 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the ICJ Statute. I'm wondering if we should draw any significance from that for the purposes that you were discussing. 15:42 1 one might have expected, given Article 38 of the ICJ Statute. I'm wondering if we should dr		21	judgment", as opposed to saying, as it does here, that,	21	One is: in Annexure G, paragraph 29, we've got the
24 I understand what you're saying, that you see it as 25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably Page 165 Page 165 Page 167 Page		22	"The doctrine of res judicata is somehow affected when	22	applicable law provision. It does refer to the
25 limited in this particular context. But it arguably Page 165 Page 165 Page 167 15:39 1 opens the door to a broader potential effect on res judicata. 3 MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that it would not open the door to a broader relevance or exception to res judicata based on climate change more broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, primarily, in the event that, as a result of a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of either party. 15 I certainly don't think and the Court was not here intending to say that climate change more broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 20 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 21 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the		23	there is a change in circumstances".	23	possibility, when necessary, of applying treaties and
15:39 1 opens the door to a broader potential effect on 2 res judicata. 3 MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that 4 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of either party. 15 I certainly don't think and the Court was not 16 here intending to say that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the		24	I understand what you're saying, that you see it as	24	applying customary international law. It does not then
15:39 1 opens the door to a broader potential effect on 2 res judicata. 3 MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that 4 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control 14 of either party. 15 I certainly don't think — and the Court was not 16 here intending to say — that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the		25	limited in this particular context. But it arguably	25	go on to refer to, for example, judicial decisions, as
15:39 1 opens the door to a broader potential effect on 2 res judicata. 3 MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that 4 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control 14 of either party. 15 I certainly don't think — and the Court was not 16 here intending to say — that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the			Page 165		Page 167
2 res judicata. 3 MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that 4 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control 14 of either party. 15 I certainly don't think and the Court was not 16 here intending to say that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the					
2 res judicata. 3 MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that 4 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control 14 of either party. 15 I certainly don't think and the Court was not 16 here intending to say that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the	15:39	1	opens the door to a broader potential effect on	15:42 1	one might have expected given Article 38 of the
3 MR FIETTA: Well, I think our position is certainly that 4 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control 14 of either party. 15 I certainly don't think and the Court was not 16 here intending to say that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the	13.37				
4 it would not open the door to a broader relevance or 5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control 14 of either party. 15 I certainly don't think — and the Court was not 16 here intending to say — that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the			-		Ţ,
5 exception to res judicata based on climate change more 6 broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, 7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control 14 of either party. 15 I certainly don't think — and the Court was not 16 here intending to say — that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 5 One thoughts, is that the Treaty elsewhere, as you've already walked us through, addresses the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards and 8 binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards and 9 Neutral Expert determinations. So perhaps that's where 10 it's picked up. But I'm wondering whether you think its absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. 11 absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. 12 MR FIETTA: Well, I think, as you say, the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards and 13 nature of Court of Arbitration awards and 14 should be absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. 15 MR FIETTA: Well, I think, as you say, the final and binding nature of Neutral Expert decisions within their competence is dealt with elsewhere, so that issue did not need to be addressed here. 16 Toertainly don't think — and the Court was very careful law, if you like, I thi					
broadly. I think this was designed to protect Pakistan, primarily, in the event that, as a result of a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. Of course, that has not happened. There has been no such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of either party. I certainly don't think and the Court was not here intending to say that climate change more here intending to say that climate change more loe elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. I thoughts, is that the Treaty elsewhere, as you've already walked us through, addresses the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards and Neutral Expert determinations. So perhaps that's where it's picked up. But I'm wondering whether you think its absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. MR FIETTA: Well, I think, as you say, the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards and Neutral Expert determinations. So perhaps that's where it's picked up. But I'm wondering whether you think its absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. MR FIETTA: Well, I think, as you say, the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards and MR FIETTA: Well I, think, as you say, the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards and I absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. MR FIETTA: Well, I think as you say, the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards and I absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. II absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. II absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. II absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. II absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. II absence here, in			_		_
7 primarily, in the event that, as a result of 8 a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow 9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control 14 of either party. 15 I certainly don't think and the Court was not 16 here intending to say that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the		6			
9 on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on 10 the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of 11 either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. 12 Of course, that has not happened. There has been no 13 such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control 14 of either party. 15 I certainly don't think and the Court was not 16 here intending to say that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the		7	primarily, in the event that, as a result of	7	already walked us through, addresses the final and
the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. Of course, that has not happened. There has been no such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of either party. I certainly don't think and the Court was not here intending to say that climate change more broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the In the minimum flow if these factors outside the control it's picked up. But I'm wondering whether you think its absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance. MR FIETTA: Well, I think, as you say, the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards under the Treaty is dealt with elsewhere, and the limited final and binding nature of Neutral Expert decisions within their competence is dealt with elsewhere, so that issue did not need to be addressed here. As regards broader jurisprudence in international law, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as such, directly. But of course those decisions do come		8	a fundamental change on that specific river and the flow	8	binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards and
either party should necessitate such a reconsideration. Of course, that has not happened. There has been no such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of either party. I certainly don't think and the Court was not here intending to say that climate change more broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept to indicate the limits of that principle in similar MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the MR FIETTA: Well, I think, as you say, the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards under the Treaty is dealt with elsewhere, and the limited final and binding nature of Neutral Expert decisions within their competence is dealt with elsewhere, so that issue did not need to be addressed here. As regards broader jurisprudence in international law, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as such, directly. But of course those decisions do come		9	on the river, an ability to reconsider the decision on	9	Neutral Expert determinations. So perhaps that's where
Of course, that has not happened. There has been no such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of either party. I certainly don't think and the Court was not here intending to say that climate change more broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. MR FIETTA: Well, I think, as you say, the final and binding nature of Court of Arbitration awards under the Treaty is dealt with elsewhere, and the limited final and binding nature of Neutral Expert decisions within their competence is dealt with elsewhere, so that issue did not need to be addressed here. As regards broader jurisprudence in international law, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as such, directly. But of course those decisions do come		10	the minimum flow if these factors outside the control of	10	it's picked up. But I'm wondering whether you think its
such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control of either party. I certainly don't think and the Court was not here intending to say that climate change more broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. I anature of Court of Arbitration awards under the Treaty is dealt with elsewhere, and the limited final and binding nature of Neutral Expert decisions within their competence is dealt with elsewhere, so that issue did not need to be addressed here. As regards broader jurisprudence in international law, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the		11	either party should necessitate such a reconsideration.	11	absence here, in paragraph 29, is of any significance.
of either party. I certainly don't think and the Court was not here intending to say that climate change more broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. 14 is dealt with elsewhere, and the limited final and binding nature of Neutral Expert decisions within their competence is dealt with elsewhere, so that issue did not need to be addressed here. As regards broader jurisprudence in international law, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the		12	Of course, that has not happened. There has been no	12	MR FIETTA: Well, I think, as you say, the final and binding
15 I certainly don't think and the Court was not 16 here intending to say that climate change more 17 broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules 18 set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 19 and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw 20 elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept 21 of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful 22 to indicate the limits of that principle in similar 23 terms. 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 26 binding nature of Neutral Expert decisions within their 27 competence is dealt with elsewhere, so that issue did 28 not need to be addressed here. 29 As regards broader jurisprudence in international 20 law, if you like, I think two points. 20 I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of 21 this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing 22 the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly 23 indicate a role in the interpretation or application of 24 this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as 25 such, directly. But of course those decisions do come		13	such dramatic change in circumstances beyond the control	13	nature of Court of Arbitration awards under the Treaty
here intending to say that climate change more broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. here intending to say that climate change more competence is dealt with elsewhere, so that issue did not need to be addressed here. As regards broader jurisprudence in international law, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the set under the Treaty, including as regards the design not need to be addressed here. As regards broader jurisprudence in international law, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as such, directly. But of course those decisions do come		14			
broadly could be a basis to reopen hard and fast rules set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the not need to be addressed here. As regards broader jurisprudence in international law, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as such, directly. But of course those decisions do come			-		
set under the Treaty, including as regards the design and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the set under the Treaty, including as regards the design 18 As regards broader jurisprudence in international 19 law, if you like, I think two points. 20 I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of 21 this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing 22 the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly 23 indicate a role in the interpretation or application of 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 26 such, directly. But of course those decisions do come					_
and operation of HEPs on the Western Rivers. And we saw elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. Haw, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the law, if you like, I think two points. I think it makes sense, given the specific nature of this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as such, directly. But of course those decisions do come					
elsewhere in the award, in connection with the concept of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 1					
of environmental flow, that the Court was very careful to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. 21 this Treaty almost a lex specialis around governing the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 25 such, directly. But of course those decisions do come			-		
to indicate the limits of that principle in similar terms. MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the terms. the Indus Waters that it should not explicitly indicate a role in the interpretation or application of this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as such, directly. But of course those decisions do come			-		
terms. 23 indicate a role in the interpretation or application of 24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 26 this Treaty to broader international jurisprudence, as 27 such, directly. But of course those decisions do come					
24 MR MINEAR: In common law jurisdictions, it's commonplace, 25 when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 25 such, directly. But of course those decisions do come					
when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the 25 such, directly. But of course those decisions do come					
D 160		25	when an equitable decree is entered, to provide that the	25	such, directly. But of course those decisions do come
Page 106			Page 166		Page 168

15:44 1	in in any event through the fact that customary	15:47 1	we'll resume and hopefully we'll make up time.
13.44 1	international law itself is part of the applicable law	13.47 1	SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much.
3	here in certain situations, and of course customary	3	
	-		(3.47 pm)
4	international law itself will provide a gateway to the	4	(A short break)
5	citation of international jurisprudence.	5	(4.02 pm)
6	Clearly paragraph 29 is very carefully drafted so as	6	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are reassembled. So,
7	to limit aspects of the applicable law, and to focus on	7	Mr Fietta, whenever you're ready, please proceed.
8	primarily the primary importance of the wording of the	8	MR FIETTA: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court.
9	Treaty.	9	Just two quick points before I proceed, just
10	THE CHAIRMAN: I had one other relatively small question.	10	cleaning up on issues arising before the break.
11	And I do think maybe we are close to the point of	11	Your question related to the separate reasoning
12	a coffee break, and if you want to look at this during	12	wording in paragraph 23, alongside the reference to
13	the break, feel free to do so.	13	an award. Just for now, a reference, which will be
14	But it's at your Memorial, paragraph 8.73, which is	14	picked up by my colleague Professor Tanzi later in the
15	on page 239. I found that paragraph a little bit	15	week. It's addressed at Memorial paragraph 13.14, which
16	confusing. So if you could explain what is meant in due	16	addresses that issue. We'll elaborate on that
17	course, that would be helpful.	17	submission subsequently to pick up your question.
18	It refers to the possibility of relitigating before	18	And then your question just before the break in
19	a Neutral Expert a matter of Treaty interpretation that	19	relation to: paragraph 8.73 of the Memorial perhaps
20	was made by a prior Court of Arbitration, and it seems	20	could have been drafted a little more clearly. Just to
21	to allow this when the matter before the Neutral Expert	21	be 100% clear on the intention of that paragraph.
22	falls outside the dispute before the prior Court of	22	It wasn't intended to raise the possibility of
23	Arbitration. But I don't see how that's relitigating	23	relitigation of the same dispute. It is intended to
24	a matter. That's where my confusion comes from. So	24	cover the situation where a new difference arises
25	perhaps you could look at that and let us know.	25	between the parties that, as the paragraph later says,
	Page 169		Page 171
	O		ė –
15:46 1	In any event, I think we're close to a point where	16:04 1	"falls strictly outside 'the dispute' addressed in [the]
15:46 1	In any event, I think we're close to a point where we should take a break. Sir Daniel?	16:04 1 2	"falls strictly outside 'the dispute' addressed in [the] earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore
	we should take a break. Sir Daniel?		earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore
2	-	2	
2 3	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman.	2 3	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different
2 3 4	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and	2 3 4	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of
2 3 4 5	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with	2 3 4 5	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute.
2 3 4 5 6	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and	2 3 4 5 6	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of
2 3 4 5 6 7	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with	2 3 4 5 6 7	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions from the Court, because the compendium of questions that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F. (Slide 33) Paragraph 11 makes clear that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions from the Court, because the compendium of questions that we are compiling will in fact inform our second-round	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F. (Slide 33) Paragraph 11 makes clear that: "[A] decision of a Neutral Expert on all matters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions from the Court, because the compendium of questions that we are compiling will in fact inform our second-round submissions. But it may be that we will have a bit of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F. (Slide 33) Paragraph 11 makes clear that: "[A] decision of a Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions from the Court, because the compendium of questions that we are compiling will in fact inform our second-round submissions. But it may be that we will have a bit of a self-denying ordinance in actually giving answers, or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F. (Slide 33) Paragraph 11 makes clear that: "[A] decision of a Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter [concerned]"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions from the Court, because the compendium of questions that we are compiling will in fact inform our second-round submissions. But it may be that we will have a bit of a self-denying ordinance in actually giving answers, or answers of any length.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F. (Slide 33) Paragraph 11 makes clear that: "[A] decision of a Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter [concerned]" And specifically addressing all of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions from the Court, because the compendium of questions that we are compiling will in fact inform our second-round submissions. But it may be that we will have a bit of a self-denying ordinance in actually giving answers, or answers of any length. I do want to make sure that Professor Webb has at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F. (Slide 33) Paragraph 11 makes clear that: "[A] decision of a Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter [concerned]" And specifically addressing all of the constituencies in your question, effectively, including
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions from the Court, because the compendium of questions that we are compiling will in fact inform our second-round submissions. But it may be that we will have a bit of a self-denying ordinance in actually giving answers, or answers of any length. I do want to make sure that Professor Webb has at least 75 minutes to cover the ground before 5.30.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F. (Slide 33) Paragraph 11 makes clear that: "[A] decision of a Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter [concerned]" And specifically addressing all of the constituencies in your question, effectively, including a future Court of Arbitration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions from the Court, because the compendium of questions that we are compiling will in fact inform our second-round submissions. But it may be that we will have a bit of a self-denying ordinance in actually giving answers, or answers of any length. I do want to make sure that Professor Webb has at least 75 minutes to cover the ground before 5.30. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that's fine. Why don't we take just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F. (Slide 33) Paragraph 11 makes clear that: "[A] decision of a Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter [concerned]" And specifically addressing all of the constituencies in your question, effectively, including a future Court of Arbitration. To the extent that the decision of the Neutral
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	we should take a break. Sir Daniel? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I had just a practical question. I notice and we'll have an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Fietta but he's got a fair way still to go, and from a position where we were feeling comfortable with time, I think we're now feeling a bit stressed with time. So I just have a question as to whether you would be content to shrink the coffee break just a little bit, as we were discussing just before lunch, and I will discuss with Mr Fietta whether he might be a little accelerated in respect of what he still has to cover. In saying this, I would like, though, to emphasise that we absolutely do not want to cut off any questions from the Court, because the compendium of questions that we are compiling will in fact inform our second-round submissions. But it may be that we will have a bit of a self-denying ordinance in actually giving answers, or answers of any length. I do want to make sure that Professor Webb has at least 75 minutes to cover the ground before 5.30. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that's fine. Why don't we take just a 15-minute coffee break, come back roughly at the top	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	earlier Court of Arbitration [decision]". And therefore we would say that in that situation the concept of res judicata would not apply because it is a different dispute. (Slide 32) Turning then to Neutral Expert decisions. I can be much briefer, because we've addressed many of the principles and paragraphs of the Kishenganga award relevant to this issue. Decisions of Neutral Experts appointed under the Treaty are final and binding on the parties, on Courts of Arbitration and on other Neutral Experts, but only on matters falling within their more limited competence under the Treaty. And this is made clear by the Treaty itself at paragraphs 7 and 11 of Annexure F. (Slide 33) Paragraph 11 makes clear that: "[A] decision of a Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter [concerned]" And specifically addressing all of the constituencies in your question, effectively, including a future Court of Arbitration. To the extent that the decision of the Neutral Expert therefore falls within his or her competence,

1.50			4500 4	
16:05	1	issues concerned at the specific plant concerned, and my	16:08 1	regards this issue of drawdown flushing in particular.
	2	previous submissions on res judicata would apply in that	2	The Court observed (PLA-3, paragraph 522):
	3	strict context.	3	"It is not for the Court to apply 'best practices'
	4	(Slide 34) Crucially, however, pursuant to	4	in resolving this dispute any exercise of design
	5	Article IX of the Treaty, the competence of a Neutral	5	involves consideration of a variety of factors not
	6	Expert is limited to a closed list of differences of	6	all of them technical."
	7	a technical or engineering nature falling within the	7	Then the Court goes on, in a passage we've read
	8	list at subparagraphs 1 to 23 of paragraph 1 of Part 1	8	previously, to talk about, among other things, the
	9	of Annexure F. And this is commensurate with the fact,	9	regulatory constraints set by the Treaty for the design
	10	of course, that the Neutral Expert must be a "highly	10	of Indian plants. And the Court concluded by saying
	11	qualified engineer"; competent, therefore, to address	11	that:
	12	only, but importantly, those technical issues that may	12	" the optimal design and operation of a [HEP] is
	13	arise under the 23 paragraphs at Annexure F.	13	that which can practically be achieved within
	14	So unlike a Court of Arbitration, a Neutral Expert	14	constraints imposed by the Treaty."
	15	has no general interpretative competence under the	15	But, importantly, the interpretation adopted in the
	16	Treaty and it's confined to these technical matters.	16	partial award did not apply to the Baglihar HEP, as
	17	A Neutral Expert cannot make general interpretative	17	we've seen. It was not retrospective, and Pakistan had
	18	findings or systemic findings on the wording of the	18	never requested otherwise.
	19	Treaty.	19	(Slide 37) Paragraph 469 of the Kishenganga award is
:	20	(Slide 35) Paragraph 7 of Annexure F is also	20	relevant in this context. The Court explained why its
	21	important because it confirms that the competence of	21	decision would have no effect to the Baglihar HEP. As
	22	a Neutral Expert extends to resolving disputes between	22	the Court put it, Maître Lafitte's determination had
,	23	the Commissioners as to whether any particular	23	"quite literally been realized in concrete at Baglihar".
,	24	difference falls within Part 1 of Annexure F. So	24	(Slide 38) But as the Kishenganga Court continued at
,	25	a Neutral Expert can render a binding decision with	25	paragraph 470:
		D 172		D 175
		Page 173		Page 175
16:07	1	respect to his competence which has res judicata effect,	16:10 1	"The effect of a neutral expert's determination is
	2	save insofar another important proviso as that	2	restricted to elements of the design and operation
	3	decision on competence itself takes him or her outside	3	of the specific [HEP] considered by that Expert."
	4	his or her competence and into the territory of	4	And again contrasting with the Baglihar decision,
	5	paragraph 13 of Annexure F.	5	the Court said:
	6	A Neutral Expert does not, therefore, have	6	" the present decision, by contrast, is binding
	7	compétence de la compétence in the same way as does	7	in respect of the general question presented in these
	8	a Court of Arbitration. It arises from the fact that	8	proceedings."
	9	questions of whether or not such decisions themselves	9	Paragraph 470 has summarised, in terms which are
	10	fall within the competence of a Neutral Expert, or are	10	crystal-clear, the decisive and clear difference under
	11	otherwise ultra vires under the Treaty, are subject to	11	the Treaty's dispute resolution architecture between the
	12	the overriding jurisdiction of a Court of Arbitration.	12	pervasive binding or otherwise controlling effect of
	13	Consistent with Pakistan's position, at	13	Court of Arbitration decisions on systemic issues, at
	14	paragraph 316 of its Competence Award, this Court	14	least, and the more limited binding effect of
	15	recognised that decisions of a Neutral Expert that are	15	Neutral Expert decisions.
	16	within his competence are final and binding with respect	16	Notably, in Kishenganga, even India stopped short of
	17	to the matter on which the decision was made.	17	arguing that the Baglihar determination had any binding
	18	The only dispute to have been resolved under the	18	effect on the Court of Arbitration, just as it has
	19	Treaty to date by a Neutral Expert was the Baglihar	19	stopped short of arguing that the decision has binding
:	20	decision, of course. As is well known, Pakistan	20	effect in negotiations, as we saw earlier.
:	21	profoundly disagreed with that determination.	21	(Slide 39) In its rejoinder to the Court, India
	22	(Slide 36) The Kishenganga partial award	22	explicitly stated that it did not rely on Baglihar as
:	23	subsequently agreed with Pakistan, and thus squarely	23	constituting a binding precedent. We can see that in
:	24	rejected the Baglihar Neutral Expert's approach, in	24	the first part of the highlighted passage here (P-227,
	25	adopting its systemic interpretation of the Treaty as	25	paragraph 4.44). Rather, India's position was more
		Page 174		Page 176
		Page 174		Page 176

48 (Pages 173 to 176)

1		1.11. 1.25.11	16.15	manufacture and described to the second
16:11	1	nuanced, talking about Baglihar being authoritative, but	16:15 1	parties with respect to those issues, or with respect to
	2	not binding:	2	the Court and present proceedings before the Neutral
	3	"Such reliance is not sought as a binding	3	Expert, and otherwise in connection with their
	4	precedent" So I think it is quite clear that India appreciates	4	competence.
	5	So I think it is quite clear that India appreciates	5	Unless there are any further questions, that will
	6	the limited effect res judicata effect, certainly	6	conclude my submission. Thank you.
	7	of Neutral Expert decisions.	7	(4.15 pm)
	8	(Slide 40) And similarly, at 4.110 of its rejoinder	8	Questions from THE COURT
	9	in Kishenganga, India did not go further than saying	9	THE CHAIRMAN: Just one question from me, Mr Fietta. I have not yet fully studied your matrix too; I look forward to
	10 11	that: "The decision of the Newtral Export in the Reguliber	10 11	not yet fully studied your matrix too; I look forward to doing so.
		"The decision of the Neutral Expert in the Baglihar	11	But I'm wondering about the circumstance where
	12	case holding [drawdown flushing] a maintenance measure	13	a Neutral Expert decides that a certain matter is within
	13	permitted by the Treaty, while not binding on this	13	his competence that is, falling within Annexure F,
	14 15	Court, is a sound precedent" So they were following the rationale, but they did	15	Part 1 and that decision is not challenged, and
	15 16	not argue that it was binding in any sense on the Court.	16	therefore doesn't go on to a Court of Arbitration. Is
	16 17	And in the Kishenganga hearing, India again referred	17	that decision on competence of the Neutral Expert
	17 18	to Baglihar not as binding but as a precedent, shying	18	thereafter binding on a Court of Arbitration?
	18	away from any legal submission that went beyond that.	19	So let's say at some later point in time, one party
	20	(Slide 41) As we've seen, the Court roundly rejected	20	or the other decides to say, "The Neutral Expert wasn't
	21	India's position at paragraph 470 of its award, saying	20	allowed to decide that matter". Is it open to a later
	22	that Baglihar did not have any general precedential	21 22	Court of Arbitration to decide that it's not final and
	23	value.	23	binding?
	24	So the sum effect of Kishenganga was then that the	23	MR FIETTA: Well, in that situation and that's reflected
	25	Court rejected the Baglihar Neutral Expert's conclusion	25	in the matrix in connection with decisions on competence
	23		23	matter in connection with decisions on competence
		Page 177		Page 179
16:13	1	that India was antitled under the Treaty to build a UED	16:17 1	of a previous Neutral Expert in the present or future
10:13	1 2	that India was entitled under the Treaty to build a HEP on the Western Rivers with a deep orifice spillway for	16:17 1	Courts of Arbitration the decision about competence
	3	the purposes of drawdown flushing. The Court concluded	3	under paragraph 7 would be binding, because it's within
	3 4	that drawdown flushing was prohibited at Indian HEPs on	4	his competence, save in respect of a situation where
	5	the Western Rivers by paragraph 14 of Annexure D and	5	there has been a challenge. But if there is no
	6	paragraph 19 of Annexure E of the Treaty.	6	challenge and no contrary decision of the Courts of
	7	This conclusion did not displace the Neutral	7	Arbitration, then there is no dilution of the
	8	Expert's determination of seven years earlier with	8	res judicata effect.
	9	respect to the Baglihar HEP, but it did apply both to	9	And of course this touches on the paragraph of
	10	the KHEP and to all future Indian HEPs on the	10	Annexure F. It's paragraph I think I mentioned it.
			1	ranicaule 1. 105 paragraph I unik 1 ilichuolicu il.
	11	Western Rivers.	11	
			11 12	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence.
	11 12 13	Western Rivers. So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you		THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence.
	12	So at this point I can conclude my submission just	12	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence.
	12 13	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of	12 13	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you:
	12 13 14	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you	12 13 14	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which
	12 13 14 15	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my	12 13 14 15	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should
	12 13 14 15 16	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to	12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it
	12 13 14 15 16 17	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to simplify things, is that Court of Arbitration decisions	12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in
	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to simplify things, is that Court of Arbitration decisions or awards within the scope of the disputes referred to	12 13 14 15 16 17	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions"
	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to simplify things, is that Court of Arbitration decisions or awards within the scope of the disputes referred to them, which can be of many different types, are binding	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions" So it would need to be raised. There would be
	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to simplify things, is that Court of Arbitration decisions or awards within the scope of the disputes referred to them, which can be of many different types, are binding on all the constituent parties there: the parties,	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions" So it would need to be raised. There would be a dispute or a difference that would be raised about
	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to simplify things, is that Court of Arbitration decisions or awards within the scope of the disputes referred to them, which can be of many different types, are binding on all the constituent parties there: the parties, future courts, Neutral Experts and future Neutral	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions" So it would need to be raised. There would be a dispute or a difference that would be raised about whether or not the decision was within the competence of
	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to simplify things, is that Court of Arbitration decisions or awards within the scope of the disputes referred to them, which can be of many different types, are binding on all the constituent parties there: the parties, future courts, Neutral Experts and future Neutral Experts; whereas the position is much more restricted on	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions" So it would need to be raised. There would be a dispute or a difference that would be raised about whether or not the decision was within the competence of the Neutral Expert. That would need to go through the
	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to simplify things, is that Court of Arbitration decisions or awards within the scope of the disputes referred to them, which can be of many different types, are binding on all the constituent parties there: the parties, future courts, Neutral Experts and future Neutral Experts; whereas the position is much more restricted on the second matrix, in connection with the decisions of	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions" So it would need to be raised. There would be a dispute or a difference that would be raised about whether or not the decision was within the competence of the Neutral Expert. That would need to go through the procedures at Article IX that ultimately end up with the
	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to simplify things, is that Court of Arbitration decisions or awards within the scope of the disputes referred to them, which can be of many different types, are binding on all the constituent parties there: the parties, future courts, Neutral Experts and future Neutral Experts; whereas the position is much more restricted on the second matrix, in connection with the decisions of a Neutral Expert, which are binding only in respect of matters within their competence, binding only on the	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions" So it would need to be raised. There would be a dispute or a difference that would be raised about whether or not the decision was within the competence of the Neutral Expert. That would need to go through the procedures at Article IX that ultimately end up with the Court of Arbitration. THE CHAIRMAN: Right. And the question is
	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So at this point I can conclude my submission just by taking you back to the matrices which I gave you earlier. I won't spend any time on the substance of them. But the net effect, as you will have heard, of my submission, and of the colour-coding in the matrix to simplify things, is that Court of Arbitration decisions or awards within the scope of the disputes referred to them, which can be of many different types, are binding on all the constituent parties there: the parties, future courts, Neutral Experts and future Neutral Experts; whereas the position is much more restricted on the second matrix, in connection with the decisions of a Neutral Expert, which are binding only in respect of	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 13 is where it could be challenged as outside competence. MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you: " if any [decision] (including a claim) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions" So it would need to be raised. There would be a dispute or a difference that would be raised about whether or not the decision was within the competence of the Neutral Expert. That would need to go through the procedures at Article IX that ultimately end up with the Court of Arbitration.

49 (Pages 177 to 180)

16:18	•	16:22 1	This bargain consists, on the one hand, that
	2 THE CHAIRMAN: And the question is: if it doesn't do that,	2	Pakistan "shall receive for unrestricted use all those
	and at some later point in time, before some other Court	3	waters" on the Western Rivers, as a result of which
	of Arbitration, there's a challenge made that that was	4	India must "let flow" those waters and "shall not permit
	outside the competence of the Neutral Expert, is that to	5	any interference with [those] waters". That's on the
	be regarded as final and binding because it wasn't	6	one hand.
	7 challenged at the time, or not?	7	The other side of the bargain is the tightly
	8 MR FIETTA: Yes.	8	constrained exceptions, including the exception that the
	9 THE CHAIRMAN: So if that's true, then to the extent that	9	waters of the Western Rivers can be used for the
1	O Pakistan regards anything the Neutral Expert did in	10	generation of hydroelectric power in accordance with
1	Baglihar as being outside the scope of his competence,	11	Annexure D.
1	2 given that that was not challenged at the time, why is	12	(Slide 2) I will be proceeding in four parts.
1	3 that not regarded as final and binding by a subsequent	13	First, looking at Article III and the rule there.
1	4 Court of Arbitration such as this one?	14	Second, at the relationship between Article III and
1	5 MR FIETTA: You may need to repeat the question. Pakistan	15	other provisions, going through hydroelectric power,
1	does not, just to be clear, challenge the final and	16	other uses, and briefly on storage. Third, I'll look at
1	7 binding effect of the Baglihar determination in	17	the cooperation and reporting requirements that reflect
1	8 connection with the Baglihar plant relating to the	18	and underpin this bargain, and there is a handout for
1	9 specific issues raised in Baglihar. But did your	19	you in that regard that I will refer to at that stage.
2	0 question	20	And then finally, I will address question (b) from
2	1 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I thought I heard you say earlier in	21	paragraph 35 of Procedural Order No. 6.
2	2 your presentation that the Neutral Expert did things	22	(Slide 3) So I start with Article III of the Treaty,
2	3 outside the scope of his competence.	23	which guarantees Pakistan's exclusive use of the waters
2	4 MR FIETTA: Yes.	24	of the Western Rivers, subject to strict exceptions.
2	5 THE CHAIRMAN: And to the extent that that's Pakistan's	25	I'm not going to read it out; I'm just going to
	Page 181		Page 183
	1450 101		1450 100
16:19	1 position, is it not for this Court to look at that,	16:24 1	highlight the terms that underpin this bargain.
:	because it wasn't challenged at the time?	2	So in the first paragraph, the "unrestricted use"
:	3 MR FIETTA: Well, he did that, but only in connection with	3	accorded to Pakistan, and the matching obligation of
	his decision concerning the Baglihar plant. So those	4	India to "let flow".
:	broader statements of Treaty interpretation, object and	5	In the second paragraph, again the obligation to
	purpose, they are certainly not of any legal consequence	6	"let flow", and the more precise obligation not to
•	in this proceeding because they were context to his	7	"permit interference" with those waters. And
	specific decision in relation to the technical issues	8	I'll come to the definition of that.
!	that he decided at the Baglihar plant.	9	In paragraph (3), again the reference to
1		10	"unrestricted use" of the waters.
1	1	11	And in paragraph (4), "Except as provided for in
1		12	Annexures D and E", the prohibition on storage by India
1		13	of any water on those Western Rivers.
1	4 1'		
		14	Mr Minear pointed out yesterday that "let flow" is
1	5 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So	15	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And
1	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have	15 16	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking
1 1	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating	15 16 17	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions,
1 1 1	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause)	15 16 17 18	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the
1 1 1 1	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause) Professor, please proceed.	15 16 17 18 19	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the Indus Waters "unrestricted use"/"let
1 1 1 1 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause) Professor, please proceed. (4.22 pm)	15 16 17 18 19 20	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the Indus Waters "unrestricted use"/"let flow"/"non-interference" obligation; again reinforcing
1 1 1 2 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause) Professor, please proceed. (4.22 pm) Submissions on the Western Rivers Run-of-River Hydro Bargain	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the Indus Waters "unrestricted use"/"let flow"/"non-interference" obligation; again reinforcing the very bespoke nature of this Treaty.
1 1 1 1 2 2 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause) Professor, please proceed. (4.22 pm) Submissions on the Western Rivers Run-of-River Hydro Bargain PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman,	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the Indus Waters "unrestricted use"/"let flow"/"non-interference" obligation; again reinforcing the very bespoke nature of this Treaty. The concept of "flow" itself is included in
1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause) Professor, please proceed. (4.22 pm) Submissions on the Western Rivers Run-of-River Hydro Bargain PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. I'll be addressing you on the	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the Indus Waters "unrestricted use"/"let flow"/"non-interference" obligation; again reinforcing the very bespoke nature of this Treaty. The concept of "flow" itself is included in a handful of agreements, but with a very different
1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause) Professor, please proceed. (4.22 pm) Submissions on the Western Rivers Run-of-River Hydro Bargain PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. I'll be addressing you on the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain which	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the Indus Waters "unrestricted use"/"let flow"/"non-interference" obligation; again reinforcing the very bespoke nature of this Treaty. The concept of "flow" itself is included in a handful of agreements, but with a very different emphasis and scope. And just to give you one example,
1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause) Professor, please proceed. (4.22 pm) Submissions on the Western Rivers Run-of-River Hydro Bargain PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. I'll be addressing you on the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain which	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the Indus Waters "unrestricted use"/"let flow"/"non-interference" obligation; again reinforcing the very bespoke nature of this Treaty. The concept of "flow" itself is included in a handful of agreements, but with a very different
1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause) Professor, please proceed. (4.22 pm) Submissions on the Western Rivers Run-of-River Hydro Bargain PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. I'll be addressing you on the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain which	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the Indus Waters "unrestricted use"/"let flow"/"non-interference" obligation; again reinforcing the very bespoke nature of this Treaty. The concept of "flow" itself is included in a handful of agreements, but with a very different emphasis and scope. And just to give you one example,
1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Fietta. So we appreciate your presentation, and I think we now have Professor Webb to take up the task of further educating the Court about the matters at hand. (Pause) Professor, please proceed. (4.22 pm) Submissions on the Western Rivers Run-of-River Hydro Bargain PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. I'll be addressing you on the Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain which underpins the Treaty.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an unusual form of words in treaty practice. And Pakistan, insofar as it's been able to determine looking at a database of 600 international water conventions, has found that there is no direct comparator to the Indus Waters "unrestricted use"/"let flow"/"non-interference" obligation; again reinforcing the very bespoke nature of this Treaty. The concept of "flow" itself is included in a handful of agreements, but with a very different emphasis and scope. And just to give you one example, the 1961 US-Canada Treaty relating to Cooperative

50 (Pages 181 to 184)

16:25 1	Development of the Water Resources of the Columbia River	16:28 1	each country."
2	Basin (PLA-100, Article II(1)) refers to Canada	2	And the appendix to that letter noted that
3	providing certain storage "usable for improving the flow	3	interference by hydroelectric work "is repugnant to the
4	of the Columbia River". So a very different use of	4	provisions of the Adjusted Bank Proposal and Pakistan
5	"flow" there.	5	cannot agree to any such works in areas under the
6	(Slide 4) So four points are worth noting about the	6	control of India".
7	wording of paragraph (1) of Article III.	7	So that was the position on 10 September 1957.
8	The first is that "let flow" is the corollary	8	As we heard from Ms Rees-Evans, Pakistan came under
9	obligation of Pakistan's right of "unrestricted use":	9	pressure from the World Bank and eventually made
10	they go together.	10	a concession. It accepted a narrow exception to its
11	"Let flow" is not framed in terms of an obligation	11	right of unrestricted use during August and
12	of non-appropriation. So India can use the waters of	12	September 1959.
13	the Western Rivers, so long as they are replaced in	13	(Slide 6) So a provision for a carve-out for India's
14	an equivalent amount.	14	generation of hydroelectric power then appeared in
15	"Let flow" is a positive obligation: that means	15	the heads of agreement from 1959 (P-136), and the
16	it is a starting point for analysing compliance, not	16	language was one of entitlement. You see that on the
17	an afterthought.	17	left-hand side of the slide. At that time India was
18	And "let flow" is not limited in terms of the	18	being "entitled to generate hydro-electric power". But
19	volume: it applies to all the relevant waters. So it	19	with the first drafts of the Treaty itself, it changed
20	wouldn't be permissible, for example, for India to argue	20	into an exception from an entitlement, and you see that
21	that it only partially impeded the flow of the Western	21	in the document on the right (P-139).
22	Rivers. "Let flow" is associated with "all the waters".	22	This shift from entitlement on the part of India to
23	And of course this is relevant to the Treaty bargain	23	an exception that India has to come within is
24	that we've set out, where India was allocated the waters	24	significant, because it makes "unrestricted use" and
25	of the Eastern Rivers for its use under the Treaty.	25	"let flow" the rule, and the generation of hydroelectric
	Page 185		Page 187
16:27 1	Article III(2) introduces the principle of	16:30 1	power under certain conditions the exception.
2	non-interference with the waters of the Western Rivers,	2	So I spoke yesterday about context in the role of
3	except for tight restrictions. And the parties	3	treaty interpretation, and that involves looking at
4	understood at the time that this meant that India should	4	other provisions of the Treaty. And I turn, with that,
5	not alter the flow, in quantity or timeliness, of the	5	to Article I(15) and the travaux behind that provision,
6	Western Rivers as they pass into Pakistan.	6	which defines the obligation of non-interference.
7	Ms Rees-Evans has already taken you through the	7	(Slide 7) So in the draft of December 1959 (P-139), it was quite a brief statement that:
8 9	travaux; I am not going to go through them in detail. But I just want to highlight a handful of documents that	8	ii was dinie a brief statement mat:
10	But I just want to highlight a handrul of documents that	0	•
		9	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any
	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through	10	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction
11	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations.	10 11	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow"
11 12	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's	10 11 12	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the
11 12 13	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420).	10 11 12 13	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict
11 12 13 14	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations	10 11 12 13 14	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads:
11 12 13 14 15	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And	10 11 12 13 14 15	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which
11 12 13 14 15	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says:	10 11 12 13 14 15	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in
11 12 13 14 15 16	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is vulnerable to interference by India. By introducing for	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to an afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is vulnerable to interference by India. By introducing for the first time at this stage new uses on [the] Western	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to an afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass, etc., shall not be deemed to be an interference
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is vulnerable to interference by India. By introducing for the first time at this stage new uses on [the] Western Rivers [such as the] unrestricted right to develop	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to an afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass, etc., shall not be deemed to be an interference with the waters."
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is vulnerable to interference by India. By introducing for the first time at this stage new uses on [the] Western Rivers [such as the] unrestricted right to develop hydro-electric power from those rivers, India has, while	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to an afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass, etc., shall not be deemed to be an interference with the waters." So this language was inserted in response to
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is vulnerable to interference by India. By introducing for the first time at this stage new uses on [the] Western Rivers [such as the] unrestricted right to develop hydro-electric power from those rivers, India has, while trying effectively to secure to herself the exclusive	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to an afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass, etc., shall not be deemed to be an interference with the waters." So this language was inserted in response to discussions about: what did it mean to have a change in
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is vulnerable to interference by India. By introducing for the first time at this stage new uses on [the] Western Rivers [such as the] unrestricted right to develop hydro-electric power from those rivers, India has, while trying effectively to secure to herself the exclusive use and development of the Eastern Rivers, sought to	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to an afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass, etc., shall not be deemed to be an interference with the waters." So this language was inserted in response to discussions about: what did it mean to have a change in the volume of the daily flow? And the final version of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is vulnerable to interference by India. By introducing for the first time at this stage new uses on [the] Western Rivers [such as the] unrestricted right to develop hydro-electric power from those rivers, India has, while trying effectively to secure to herself the exclusive	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to an afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass, etc., shall not be deemed to be an interference with the waters." So this language was inserted in response to discussions about: what did it mean to have a change in the volume of the daily flow? And the final version of the Treaty, in this subparagraph, gives a very clear
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is vulnerable to interference by India. By introducing for the first time at this stage new uses on [the] Western Rivers [such as the] unrestricted right to develop hydro-electric power from those rivers, India has, while trying effectively to secure to herself the exclusive use and development of the Eastern Rivers, sought to deny the reciprocal independence to Pakistan which the Bank Proposal and the Aide Memoire promised to afford to	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to an afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass, etc., shall not be deemed to be an interference with the waters." So this language was inserted in response to discussions about: what did it mean to have a change in the volume of the daily flow? And the final version of the Treaty, in this subparagraph, gives a very clear answer: any practically measurable change in the flow
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	really express the hydro bargain as it developed through the negotiations. (Slide 5) So the first is a letter from Pakistan's Minister of Industries of 10 September 1957 (P-420). So this is quite early in the process of negotiations and expresses Pakistan's position very clearly. And it says: "Being the lower riparian, Pakistan alone is vulnerable to interference by India. By introducing for the first time at this stage new uses on [the] Western Rivers [such as the] unrestricted right to develop hydro-electric power from those rivers, India has, while trying effectively to secure to herself the exclusive use and development of the Eastern Rivers, sought to deny the reciprocal independence to Pakistan which the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"The term 'interference with the waters' [is] any act of withdrawal or any man-made obstruction that causes a change in volume of the daily flow" In the final version of the Treaty, we have the emphasised language that makes very clear how strict this prohibition on interference is. It reads: "Provided, however, that an obstruction which involves only an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to an afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass, etc., shall not be deemed to be an interference with the waters." So this language was inserted in response to discussions about: what did it mean to have a change in the volume of the daily flow? And the final version of the Treaty, in this subparagraph, gives a very clear

16:31	1	caused by India that exceeds something "insignificant or	16:34 1	The parties then engaged in intense negotiation
	2	incidental" is not permitted. And the examples given,	2	through spring of 1960. This actually held up progress
	3	such as water flowing around a bridge pier, show just	3	on the drafting of the annexures of the Treaty while
	4	how strict this definition is. This affirms the	4	they tried to resolve this issue. And again, under
	5	importance of the rule in Article III of the Treaty.	5	pressure from the World Bank, Pakistan made a
	6	(Slide 8) Coming now to the third paragraph of	6	concession to include the reference to Annexure D in the
	7	Article III, which provides that "Pakistan shall have	7	draft of June 1960, so allowing the production of
	8	the unrestricted use of all waters" and "India shall not	8	hydroelectric power, but only with those criteria in
	9	make use of these waters". So this is again showing the	9	Annexure D constraining that production.
	10	underpinning of the hydro bargain, which is infused	10	Yes, Mr Chairman.
	11	throughout this provision.	11	THE CHAIRMAN: This may fall outside the remit of your
	12	Pakistan has a right to unrestricted use of all the	12	presentation. But because you mentioned the issue of
	13	waters, other than the Eastern Rivers; and on the other	13	storage as it might relate to Annexure E, are you able
	14	hand, India is prohibited from making use of these	14	to say a few words about the relationship between the
	15	waters. And the same provision so it's not put	15	two annexures? In Annexure E, there are some specified
	16	separately; it's in the same provision, so it's very	16	limitations on storage. And it wasn't entirely clear to
	17	much tied to this balance says that there will be "discharge observation stations", emphasising that	17 18	me to what extent that speaks as well to potential storage at hydroelectric plants that are governed by
	18 19	constant monitoring and cooperation is envisaged to make	19	Annexure D.
	20	this balance stick.	20	PROFESSOR WEBB: Right, right.
	21	(Slide 9) Article III(4) deals with the principle of	21	THE CHAIRMAN: And if you're able to address that now, or
	22	no storage by India, and that is subject to the	22	someone in the course of the next day or two, that would
	23	provisions of Annexures D and E.	23	be useful.
	24	As the Kishenganga Court held, this again reflects	24	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, I will be coming to it briefly. But
	25	the bargain and it reflects the object and purpose of	25	just to give a direct answer now, this is part of the
	20		20	
		Page 189		Page 191
16:33	1	the Treaty. It stated (PLA-3, paragraph 504) that:	16:36 1	context of interpretation: that the unrestricted use,
10.55	2	" one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is	2	let flow, non-interference and no storage all come
	3	to limit the storage of water by India on the	3	together in the hydro bargain.
	4	Western Rivers."	4	But having said that, Annexure E has different
	5	The travaux préparatoires confirm the importance of	5	criteria to Annexure D. Unless there's an express
	J	r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r		Criteria to Afficaute D. Officss there's all capiess
	6	the no-storage principle. I'm not going to go through	6	
		the no-storage principle. I'm not going to go through them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just	6 7	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be
	6	the no-storage principle. I'm not going to go through them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the		cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those
	6 7	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just	7	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be
	6 7 8	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the	7 8	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to
	6 7 8 9	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed.	7 8 9	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is
	6 7 8 9	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document	7 8 9 10	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are
	6 7 8 9 10	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type	7 8 9 10 11	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also	7 8 9 10 11 12	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically.
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D.
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the "total flow of the Western Rivers, excepting for	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, that's true.
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the "total flow of the Western Rivers, excepting for insignificant uses in Jammu and Kashmir only".	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, that's true. THE CHAIRMAN: But these are different storage requirements
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the "total flow of the Western Rivers, excepting for insignificant uses in Jammu and Kashmir only". A new request by India was then made of "no limit to	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, that's true. THE CHAIRMAN: But these are different storage requirements that we're talking about, in terms of what E addresses,
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the "total flow of the Western Rivers, excepting for insignificant uses in Jammu and Kashmir only". A new request by India was then made of "no limit to uses from Indus, Jhelum above lake, and Chenab RL 2000	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, that's true. THE CHAIRMAN: But these are different storage requirements that we're talking about, in terms of what E addresses, and then what pondage and freeboard and whatnot relates
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the "total flow of the Western Rivers, excepting for insignificant uses in Jammu and Kashmir only". A new request by India was then made of "no limit to uses from Indus, Jhelum above lake, and Chenab RL 2000 covering Jammu and Kashmir". This was in direct	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, that's true. THE CHAIRMAN: But these are different storage requirements that we're talking about, in terms of what E addresses, and then what pondage and freeboard and whatnot relates to in Annexure D.
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the "total flow of the Western Rivers, excepting for insignificant uses in Jammu and Kashmir only". A new request by India was then made of "no limit to uses from Indus, Jhelum above lake, and Chenab RL 2000 covering Jammu and Kashmir". This was in direct response to the strong position that Pakistan had put	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, that's true. THE CHAIRMAN: But these are different storage requirements that we're talking about, in terms of what E addresses, and then what pondage and freeboard and whatnot relates to in Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Exactly. And Mr Minear pointed out,
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the "total flow of the Western Rivers, excepting for insignificant uses in Jammu and Kashmir only". A new request by India was then made of "no limit to uses from Indus, Jhelum above lake, and Chenab RL 2000 covering Jammu and Kashmir". This was in direct	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, that's true. THE CHAIRMAN: But these are different storage requirements that we're talking about, in terms of what E addresses, and then what pondage and freeboard and whatnot relates to in Annexure D.
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the "total flow of the Western Rivers, excepting for insignificant uses in Jammu and Kashmir only". A new request by India was then made of "no limit to uses from Indus, Jhelum above lake, and Chenab RL 2000 covering Jammu and Kashmir". This was in direct response to the strong position that Pakistan had put forward.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, that's true. THE CHAIRMAN: But these are different storage requirements that we're talking about, in terms of what E addresses, and then what pondage and freeboard and whatnot relates to in Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Exactly. And Mr Minear pointed out, I think yesterday, the cross-reference in Annexure E to
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	them in detail; Ms Rees-Evans has done that. But just to highlight how this was very much in the minds of the drafters and how it was addressed. (Slide 10) So in August 1959 this is the document on the left-hand side of the screen (P-468) both parties' draft heads of agreement envisaged that India's hydroelectric use of the Western Rivers would be a type of "non-consumptive use", but India's draft also proposed that it be given a limited storage capacity for hydroelectric power plants. The President of Pakistan wrote on 21 August 1959 emphasising Pakistan's consistent position that it must be guaranteed the "total flow of the Western Rivers, excepting for insignificant uses in Jammu and Kashmir only". A new request by India was then made of "no limit to uses from Indus, Jhelum above lake, and Chenab RL 2000 covering Jammu and Kashmir". This was in direct response to the strong position that Pakistan had put	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cross-reference, you can't transpose them. And those specifications on storage in Annexure E would not be applicable to a run-of-river plant, as opposed to a storage work that is governed by Annexure E. What is important from this is how strict those conditions are even for a storage work, reflecting again how strict Annexure D criteria are as well. But we can certainly come back to that more specifically. THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful. Just if I understand it, the storage works regulated by Annexure E may well be associated with a hydroelectric plant governed by Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, that's true. THE CHAIRMAN: But these are different storage requirements that we're talking about, in terms of what E addresses, and then what pondage and freeboard and whatnot relates to in Annexure D. PROFESSOR WEBB: Exactly. And Mr Minear pointed out,

52 (Pages 189 to 192)

*			
16:37 1	"Pondage", capital P, in Annexure D. So where that is	16:40 1	provision.
2	expressly cross-referenced, then you would read them	2	I now turn to five factors that reinforce this
3	together. But otherwise, these are dealing with	3	rule-exception relationship.
4	separate works; and where they do coincide, that's	4	(Slide 12) The first is just the text: the way that
5	specifically dealt with in the Treaty.	5	the exception is expressly addressed on the face of
6	(Slide 11) So that brings me to the relationship	6	Article III.
7	between Article III and the provisions of the Treaty in	7	The second is that the exceptions are not only
8	other sections. And this brings me to the relationship	8	exceptions to India's let-flow obligation, but also to
9	between the rule and the exception. And you could	9	Pakistan's right of unrestricted use, and the injunction
10	combine these in one diagram. But just because we're	10	that India shall not permit any interference with the
11	not dealing with Annexure E as such in this dispute, you	11	waters of the Western Rivers. "Interference with the
12	can see the difference there.	12	waters of the Western Rivers" is a term of art.
13	So we have the unrestricted use, let flow,	13	I've just shown you how strict it is: it basically just
14	non-interference and no storage as the rule; and the	14	excludes water going around a bridge pier or a temporary
15	exceptions set out in Article III and the paragraphs of	15	bypass. So the "let-flow" obligation is broad. The
16	Annexure D; the no storage rule which is subject to	16	non-interference obligation is clear and precise.
17	Annexures D and E.	17	The third point is that the hydroelectric power
18	I want to come back here to the Treaty point and	18	generation exception in Article III(2)(d) is expressly
19	Sir Humphrey Waldock, which Sir Daniel flagged this	19 20	contingent on compliance with Annexure D. It doesn't say simply that India can use the waters of the Western
20	morning.	20	Rivers for hydroelectric power generation; it says it
21	Mr Chairman, yesterday you observed that the	21 22	can use the waters "as set out in Annexure D".
22 23	restrictive interpretation canon had been considered by the ILC and not expressly included in Articles 31 and 32	23	So Annexure D is an inextricable part of
23	of the Vienna Convention. And you suggested that India	23	hydroelectric power generation. And if India does not
25	may prefer a competing canon of interpretation, also not	25	bring itself within the terms and conditions of
23	may prefer a competing canon of interpretation, also not	23	orning itself within the terms and conditions of
	Page 193		Page 195
16:39 1	expressly in Articles 31 or 32, that would interpret the	16:42 1	Annexure D. then it cannot bring itself within the
16:39 1 2	expressly in Articles 31 or 32, that would interpret the exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that	16:42 1 2	Annexure D, then it cannot bring itself within the hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this
2	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that	16:42 1 2 3	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this
2 3	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to	2 3	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's
2	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that.	2	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this
2 3 4	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of	2 3 4	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his
2 3 4 5	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that.	2 3 4 5	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty
2 3 4 5 6	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the	2 3 4 5 6	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report).
2 3 4 5 6 7	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that	2 3 4 5 6 7	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose. And India's potential argument on interpretation,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's right to the use of the waters for hydroelectric power
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose. And India's potential argument on interpretation, looking at the exception in and of itself, doesn't work,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's right to the use of the waters for hydroelectric power generation. Paragraph 2(g) of Annexure D provides that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose. And India's potential argument on interpretation, looking at the exception is written into the rule. It is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's right to the use of the waters for hydroelectric power generation. Paragraph 2(g) of Annexure D provides that a run-of-river plant is one "that develops power without
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose. And India's potential argument on interpretation, looking at the exception in and of itself, doesn't work, because the exception is written into the rule. It is not just in Annexure D: it is in Article III itself. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's right to the use of the waters for hydroelectric power generation. Paragraph 2(g) of Annexure D provides that a run-of-river plant is one "that develops power without Live Storage except for Pondage". And the criteria
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose. And India's potential argument on interpretation, looking at the exception in and of itself, doesn't work, because the exception is written into the rule. It is not just in Annexure D: it is in Article III itself. So we cannot construe Article III without construing the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's right to the use of the waters for hydroelectric power generation. Paragraph 2(g) of Annexure D provides that a run-of-river plant is one "that develops power without Live Storage except for Pondage". And the criteria in paragraph 8 of Annexure D are those to which the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose. And India's potential argument on interpretation, looking at the exception in and of itself, doesn't work, because the exception is written into the rule. It is not just in Annexure D: it is in Article III itself. So we cannot construe Article III without construing the exception, and we cannot construe Annexure D without	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's right to the use of the waters for hydroelectric power generation. Paragraph 2(g) of Annexure D provides that a run-of-river plant is one "that develops power without Live Storage except for Pondage". And the criteria in paragraph 8 of Annexure D are those to which the design of any new run-of-river plant "shall conform";
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose. And India's potential argument on interpretation, looking at the exception in and of itself, doesn't work, because the exception is written into the rule. It is not just in Annexure D: it is in Article III itself. So we cannot construe Article III without construing the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's right to the use of the waters for hydroelectric power generation. Paragraph 2(g) of Annexure D provides that a run-of-river plant is one "that develops power without Live Storage except for Pondage". And the criteria in paragraph 8 of Annexure D are those to which the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose. And India's potential argument on interpretation, looking at the exception in and of itself, doesn't work, because the exception is written into the rule. It is not just in Annexure D: it is in Article III itself. So we cannot construe Article III without construing the exception, and we cannot construe Annexure D without	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's right to the use of the waters for hydroelectric power generation. Paragraph 2(g) of Annexure D provides that a run-of-river plant is one "that develops power without Live Storage except for Pondage". And the criteria in paragraph 8 of Annexure D are those to which the design of any new run-of-river plant "shall conform";
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	exception in of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. And I just want to set out Pakistan's position on that. First of all, there is evidence in the travaux of the Vienna Convention, and certainly in the jurisprudence of international courts since then, that there is a customary principle that exceptions to a rule are to be interpreted restrictively. But quite apart from that, and in any event, we do not need to rely on a canon of restrictive interpretation because, as Sir Daniel said this morning, in application of the general rule, Article 31, we reach a narrow interpretation of Annexure D. It is compelled by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the context, by the obligation of good faith, by the ordinary meaning of the words and by the effet utile, which is linked to the object and purpose. And India's potential argument on interpretation, looking at the exception in and of itself, doesn't work, because the exception is written into the rule. It is not just in Annexure D: it is in Article III itself. So we cannot construe Article III without construing the exception, and we cannot construe Annexure D without construing the rule. It's not a self-standing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	hydroelectric power exception in Article III. And this would be compatible with Sir Humphrey Waldock's preference, which is that the basic rule of treaty interpretation is the primacy of the text (from his Third Report). The fourth factor is that the terms of Article III(4) are an injunction that is not located in paragraph (2) of Article III. It is instead set out in a self-standing clause that is subject to its own exception which I have already taken you to, "Except as provided in Annexures D and E". So these two rules and these two exceptions together complete the circle by conditioning any use and storage of water by India on the Western Rivers with complying with strict criteria set out in the Treaty. And fifth, as we will explain in the coming days, the terms of Annexure D itself heavily constrain India's right to the use of the waters for hydroelectric power generation. Paragraph 2(g) of Annexure D provides that a run-of-river plant is one "that develops power without Live Storage except for Pondage". And the criteria in paragraph 8 of Annexure D are those to which the design of any new run-of-river plant "shall conform"; mandatory language. So the effect is again to reinforce

53 (Pages 193 to 196)

16:43 1	this rule-exception relationship.	16:47 1	different to how it would be used in ordinary
2	I now turn to the relationship between Article III	2	engineering usage. It's been tailored to the Treaty.
3	and the provisions on hydroelectric power.	3	"Live Storage", pursuant to paragraph 2(b) of
4	(Slide 12) Under the hydro bargain, India is	4	Annexure D, is the water in the reservoir above the dead
5	entitled to generate hydroelectric power insofar as	5	storage level, used operationally.
6	it does so within the constraints set out. So I'm not	6	And "Pondage" we'll be spending a lot of time on
7	going to read this out, but you see that provision	7	on Friday. [It] is defined with a special meaning of:
8	expressly there in (2)(d).	8	" Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to
9	Now, the chapeau of Article III(2) expressly	9	meet fluctuations in the discharge of the turbines
10	restricts the use of waters, save for an exception for	10	arising from variations in the daily and weekly
11	irrigation in Annexure C, to "the drainage basin" of the	11	loads of the plant."
12	Western Rivers.	12	And this in turn leads to the "Full Pondage Level",
13	Annexure D is divided into five parts. Two of them	13	being the normal upper level of the reservoir
14	are relevant for our purposes, the present purposes:	14	corresponding to maximum pondage that has complied with
15	Part 1, defining key terms; and Part 3, on how new	15	paragraph 8(c).
16	run-of-river plants are to be designed and operated.	16	And above the operating pool we have "Surcharge
17	(Slide 13) So paragraph 1 of Annexure D again has	17	Storage", which is "uncontrollable storage occupying
18	this constraining language: it says that it is "subject	18	space above the Full Pondage Level", usually from
19	to the provisions of [the] Annexure", the generation of	19	emergency flood conditions.
20	the power, and "Provided that" certain criteria are met.	20	(Slide 16) So when dealing with a new run-of-river
21	So that wording of "Provided that" ensures that new	21	plant, India is required to comply with the design
22	hydroelectric plants that incorporate storage works are	22	criteria of paragraph 8, understanding these concepts
23	to be addressed under Annexure E, so that means that new	23	and designing for these concepts as they are defined in
24	run-of-river plants cannot be plants that incorporate	24	the Treaty. And these are mandatory design criteria.
25	storage works. And while run-of-river plants are	25	I'm not going to go through them; we will be hearing
23			
	Page 197		Page 199
16:45 1	permitted to store a limited volume of water as pondage,	16:48 1	a lot about them over the next two days.
	permitted to store a limited volume of water as pondage, there's a restricted volume of live storage.		•
2	there's a restricted volume of live storage.	16:48 1 2 3	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro
	· ·	2	•
2 3	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river	2 3	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the
2 3 4	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as	2 3 4	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria
2 3 4 5	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that:	2 3 4 5	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and
2 3 4 5 6	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and	2 3 4 5 6	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you
2 3 4 5 6 7	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage."	2 3 4 5 6 7	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've heard already, pursuant to paragraph 19 of Annexure E,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and purpose of the Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've heard already, pursuant to paragraph 19 of Annexure E, and extended to Annexure D by paragraph 14, cannot be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and purpose of the Treaty. (Slide 19) And the impact of these design criteria
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've heard already, pursuant to paragraph 19 of Annexure E,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and purpose of the Treaty. (Slide 19) And the impact of these design criteria can be illustrated by the change in the Kishenganga
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've heard already, pursuant to paragraph 19 of Annexure E, and extended to Annexure D by paragraph 14, cannot be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and purpose of the Treaty. (Slide 19) And the impact of these design criteria can be illustrated by the change in the Kishenganga plant and how, whether you're designing under Annexure D
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've heard already, pursuant to paragraph 19 of Annexure E, and extended to Annexure D by paragraph 14, cannot be discharged for anything other than an unforeseen emergency. The "Dead Storage Level" sits below the operating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and purpose of the Treaty. (Slide 19) And the impact of these design criteria can be illustrated by the change in the Kishenganga plant and how, whether you're designing under Annexure D or E, different issues arise.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've heard already, pursuant to paragraph 19 of Annexure E, and extended to Annexure D by paragraph 14, cannot be discharged for anything other than an unforeseen emergency. The "Dead Storage Level" sits below the operating pool and accounts for all the remaining water in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and purpose of the Treaty. (Slide 19) And the impact of these design criteria can be illustrated by the change in the Kishenganga plant and how, whether you're designing under Annexure D or E, different issues arise. So the Kishenganga plant was first conceived as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've heard already, pursuant to paragraph 19 of Annexure E, and extended to Annexure D by paragraph 14, cannot be discharged for anything other than an unforeseen emergency. The "Dead Storage Level" sits below the operating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and purpose of the Treaty. (Slide 19) And the impact of these design criteria can be illustrated by the change in the Kishenganga plant and how, whether you're designing under Annexure D or E, different issues arise.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've heard already, pursuant to paragraph 19 of Annexure E, and extended to Annexure D by paragraph 14, cannot be discharged for anything other than an unforeseen emergency. The "Dead Storage Level" sits below the operating pool and accounts for all the remaining water in the reservoir. This is a term with a special meaning, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and purpose of the Treaty. (Slide 19) And the impact of these design criteria can be illustrated by the change in the Kishenganga plant and how, whether you're designing under Annexure D or E, different issues arise. So the Kishenganga plant was first conceived as a storage work under Annexure E in 1971. In the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there's a restricted volume of live storage. (Slide 14) Paragraph 2(g) defines a run-of-river plant as one that: " develops power without Live Storage as an integral part of the plant, except for Pondage and Surcharge Storage." And Annexure D then goes on to describe in detail those design requirements, and we will be going through them in detail over the next couple of days. I just want to, in advance of that, highlight a few concepts that we will be addressing in greater detail, and some of which reflect the special meaning that I mentioned yesterday that departs from the ordinary meaning in either dictionaries or engineering parlance. (Slide 15) So "Dead Storage" is defined in paragraph 2(a) of Annexure D as the water stored in the reservoir for non-operational purposes; and, as we've heard already, pursuant to paragraph 19 of Annexure E, and extended to Annexure D by paragraph 14, cannot be discharged for anything other than an unforeseen emergency. The "Dead Storage Level" sits below the operating pool and accounts for all the remaining water in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Slide 17) But I would observe, from the hydro bargain point of view and from the point of view of the object and purpose of the Treaty, that these criteria are not value-neutral. They reflect the object and purpose of the Treaty. And Mr Fietta just showed you this paragraph in the previous presentation from the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 522), where the Court made very clear that "the optimal design and operation of a hydro-electric plant" is defined as one that "can practically be achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty". (Slide 18) So coming back to these criteria and how they reflect the hydro bargain. Except for paragraph 8(g) at the end, on regulating basins, the point of each of these criteria is to limit India's control of water and storage of water on the Western Rivers; once again, being consistent with the object and purpose of the Treaty. (Slide 19) And the impact of these design criteria can be illustrated by the change in the Kishenganga plant and how, whether you're designing under Annexure D or E, different issues arise. So the Kishenganga plant was first conceived as

54 (Pages 197 to 200)

16.50 1			
16:50 1	original design, it was to store water during the	16:53 1	you see defined in Article I(10) at the bottom of the
2	high-flow season in a 220-million-cubic-metre reservoir	2	screen. Now, the first two domestic uses are relatively
3	behind a 77-metre-high dam wall. And it was to be used	3	non-invasive: drinking, washing, sanitation, and
4	for enhanced power generation during the winter using	4	household and municipal purposes. The third so-called
5	stored water, not running water.	5	domestic use, of "industrial purposes", could be more
6	Following Pakistan's objections in the Commission,	6	significant, because it could require significant
7	India redesigned the Kishenganga plant in 2006 with	7	offtake in some industries such as mining and smelting.
8	a 35.48-metre-high dam wall and reservoir of	8	(Slide 22) But that offtake is limited by
9	18.35 million cubic metres. But in India's own words,	9	Article IV(12), which provides limits on "The use of
10	"the revised Run-of-River design is largely the same as	10	water for industrial purposes". So we have the
11	the earlier design". That was noted in the partial	11	narrowing down, through each provision, of what India is
12	award of the Kishenganga Court (PLA-3) at paragraph 236.	12	able to do with these waters.
13	Now, the numbers were much smaller. But as the Court	13	And this is interesting from the perspective of
14	explained, "the axis of the dam, the location and [the]	14	changing times, because this provision protects Pakistan
15	layout of the project, [and] its installed capacity	15	from increasing industrial demands by India in the years
16	[and] diversion works" had not changed.	16	following the Treaty's conclusion. The permitted
17	And to be clear, Pakistan considers the design and	17	consumption of water for an industrial process is
18	operation of Kishenganga to be inconsistent with the	18	limited to the quantum of use in 1960, ensuring that
19	Treaty, even moving it from a storage work to	19	India cannot take advantage of developments that require
20	a run-of-river plant, and would say it's actually better	20	more water, although it could take advantage of
21	characterised as a storage work. And as we well know,	21	technology or new knowledge that require less water.
22	it has disputes with India as regards to pondage	22	In the case of an unforeseen but later developed
23	intakes, outlets and spillways of the Kishenganga plant.	23	industrial process, India can only use it to extract
24	(Slide 20) So moving from paragraph 8 to	24	water from the Western Rivers to the extent that such
25	paragraph 15, we come to operational restrictions. And	25	a process does not have a substantially adverse effect
		_	
	Page 201		Page 203
16:51 1	paragraph 15 sets out the general rule for hydroelectric	16:55 1	on Pakistan. And under the second clause of
2	plant operation that is intended to maintain the	2	subparagraph 13, India is entitled to extract water from
3	consistency of the downstream flow.	3	the Western Rivers for use in an industrial process, but
	I won't read it out but just to point out that		
4	I won't read it out out just to point out that	4	it is obliged to use "best endeavours", as you see
5	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series		it is obliged to use "best endeavours", as you see there, "to return to the same river all water
		4	
5	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series	4 5	there, "to return to the same river all water
5 6	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the	4 5 6	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom".
5 6 7	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow.	4 5 6 7	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits
5 6 7 8	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main,	4 5 6 7 8	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in
5 6 7 8 9 10	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage	4 5 6 7 8 9	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to
5 6 7 8 9	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries.	4 5 6 7 8 9	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant
5 6 7 8 9 10	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain. (Slide 21) And once again, from the perspective of	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's in the second line of that provision.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain. (Slide 21) And once again, from the perspective of the context of the Treaty, and looking at how the other	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's in the second line of that provision. But again, that is limited under the Treaty, because
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain. (Slide 21) And once again, from the perspective of the context of the Treaty, and looking at how the other provisions cast light on paragraph 8, we see that the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's in the second line of that provision.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain. (Slide 21) And once again, from the perspective of the context of the Treaty, and looking at how the other	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's in the second line of that provision. But again, that is limited under the Treaty, because
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain. (Slide 21) And once again, from the perspective of the context of the Treaty, and looking at how the other provisions cast light on paragraph 8, we see that the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's in the second line of that provision. But again, that is limited under the Treaty, because in Article IV(2) it provides that: "In executing any scheme of flood protection or flood control each Party will avoid, as far as
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain. (Slide 21) And once again, from the perspective of the context of the Treaty, and looking at how the other provisions cast light on paragraph 8, we see that the other exceptions in Article III also reflect this rule and exception, and this control over what India is able to do.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's in the second line of that provision. But again, that is limited under the Treaty, because in Article IV(2) it provides that: "In executing any scheme of flood protection or flood control each Party will avoid, as far as practicable, any material damage to the other Party, and
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain. (Slide 21) And once again, from the perspective of the context of the Treaty, and looking at how the other provisions cast light on paragraph 8, we see that the other exceptions in Article III also reflect this rule and exception, and this control over what India is able	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's in the second line of that provision. But again, that is limited under the Treaty, because in Article IV(2) it provides that: "In executing any scheme of flood protection or flood control each Party will avoid, as far as
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain. (Slide 21) And once again, from the perspective of the context of the Treaty, and looking at how the other provisions cast light on paragraph 8, we see that the other exceptions in Article III also reflect this rule and exception, and this control over what India is able to do. So Article III(2)(a) permits "Domestic Use", which	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's in the second line of that provision. But again, that is limited under the Treaty, because in Article IV(2) it provides that: "In executing any scheme of flood protection or flood control each Party will avoid, as far as practicable, any material damage to the other Party, and any such scheme carried out by India on the Western
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	paragraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph 15 provide a series of river-specific limitations, in addition to the chapeau condition about maintaining consistency of flow. So we have specific conditions for Chenab Main, different locations, and then on the Jhelum and the tributaries. Paragraph 15 also imposes additional storage limitations on India. India cannot, for example, use a hydroelectric plant reservoir to store 100% of the waters for a fortnight and then release it down in a flood, creating downstream hazards for Pakistan. So once again, these conditions, this consistency of flow and this absence of interruption, reinforce the rule underlying the hydro bargain. (Slide 21) And once again, from the perspective of the context of the Treaty, and looking at how the other provisions cast light on paragraph 8, we see that the other exceptions in Article III also reflect this rule and exception, and this control over what India is able to do.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there, "to return to the same river all water withdrawn therefrom". (Slide 23) Article III(2)(b) permits "Non-Consumptive Use", and that is defined in Article I(11). India can only rely on this exception to the extent that the use in question is for a relevant purpose, which are listed there. And it has to ensure that any water removed from the watercourse, beyond a de minimis amount, is returned to it; again, consistent with the let-flow obligation. You will note in Article I(11), and relevant discussions that we've been having over the last couple of days, that one "Non-Consumptive Use" by India is for the purpose of "flood protection or flood control"; it's in the second line of that provision. But again, that is limited under the Treaty, because in Article IV(2) it provides that: "In executing any scheme of flood protection or flood control each Party will avoid, as far as practicable, any material damage to the other Party, and

55 (Pages 201 to 204)

16:56	Rivers shall not involve any use of water or any storage	16:59 1	not be in this table. But can I come back to you on
10.50	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2	that?
3		3	MR MINEAR: Sure, that would be fine. Thank you.
4	*	4	PROFESSOR WEBB: And I should emphasise that whether it was
5		5	a storage work or a run-of-river plant, Pakistan's
6		6	position is it did not comply with the Treaty.
7	•	7	MR MINEAR: Thank you.
8		8	PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 28) So paragraph 11 has the detailed
g		9	design criteria for storage works, not run-of-river
10		10	works. And I'm not going to go through them, but what
1.		11	I will refer to is what the Kishenganga Court said.
12	6	12	(Slide 29) And this runs through the theme of both
13		13	what the Kishenganga Court said (paragraph 506) and what
14		14	the Treaty requires, which is that:
15		15	" the Treaty doesn't [just] restrict the Parties
10	store any water or construct storage works",	16	from taking certain actions"
17	"Except as provided in Annexures D and E". The	17	It doesn't just prohibit the use of storage on
18	exception is built into the primary provision. We can't	18	certain rivers:
19	separate them and read them in a different way.	19	" but [it] constrains their entitlement to
20	(Slide 26) Under the Treaty, the capacity of India	20	construct works that would enable such action to be
2		21	taken."
22		22	So it's not that the act has yet taken place; it's
23	9	23	that even the means to undertake that act are
24	1 1	24	constrained, and sometimes prohibited.
25	impounding the waters of a stream"	25	(Slide 30) So the hydro bargain also relies not just
	Page 205		Page 207
	- 100 - 00		- 450 Zo.
16:58 1	(Slide 27) And I don't know if this is what you were	17:00 1	on this rule-exception relationship, but on cooperation
16:58 1 2	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of	17:00 1 2	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to
	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of		and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the
2 3 4	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very	2 3 4	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties.
2 3	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts.	2 3 4 5	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how
2 3 4 5 6	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb?	2 3 4 5 6	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and
2 3 4 5 6 7	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear.	2 3 4 5 6 7	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum. MR MINEAR: The Neelum, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is important is: there is no blank column there. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum. MR MINEAR: The Neelum, yes. Well, is it subject to the power storage capacity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is important is: there is no blank column there. The parties are inextricably linked in how they are meant to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum. MR MINEAR: The Neelum, yes. Well, is it subject to the power storage capacity limitation set forth in paragraph 7? If it's on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is important is: there is no blank column there. The parties are inextricably linked in how they are meant to be cooperating and sharing information throughout the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum. MR MINEAR: The Neelum, yes. Well, is it subject to the power storage capacity limitation set forth in paragraph 7? If it's on the Jhelum, it says "Nil", "Power Storage Capacity".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is important is: there is no blank column there. The parties are inextricably linked in how they are meant to be cooperating and sharing information throughout the design and operation and construction process.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum. MR MINEAR: The Neelum, yes. Well, is it subject to the power storage capacity limitation set forth in paragraph 7? If it's on the Jhelum, it says "Nil", "Power Storage Capacity". I don't understand how the power storage capacity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is important is: there is no blank column there. The parties are inextricably linked in how they are meant to be cooperating and sharing information throughout the design and operation and construction process. So Article VI(2) provides that either party may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum. MR MINEAR: The Neelum, yes. Well, is it subject to the power storage capacity limitation set forth in paragraph 7? If it's on the Jhelum, it says "Nil", "Power Storage Capacity". I don't understand how the power storage capacity limitations would allow that at Kishenganga.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is important is: there is no blank column there. The parties are inextricably linked in how they are meant to be cooperating and sharing information throughout the design and operation and construction process. So Article VI(2) provides that either party may request the supply of data relating to the hydrology of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum. MR MINEAR: The Neelum, yes. Well, is it subject to the power storage capacity limitation set forth in paragraph 7? If it's on the Jhelum, it says "Nil", "Power Storage Capacity". I don't understand how the power storage capacity limitations would allow that at Kishenganga. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. I will have to come back to you. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is important is: there is no blank column there. The parties are inextricably linked in how they are meant to be cooperating and sharing information throughout the design and operation and construction process. So Article VI(2) provides that either party may request the supply of data relating to the hydrology of the rivers. Article VII, on "Future co-operation",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum. MR MINEAR: The Neelum, yes. Well, is it subject to the power storage capacity limitation set forth in paragraph 7? If it's on the Jhelum, it says "Nil", "Power Storage Capacity". I don't understand how the power storage capacity limitations would allow that at Kishenganga.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is important is: there is no blank column there. The parties are inextricably linked in how they are meant to be cooperating and sharing information throughout the design and operation and construction process. So Article VI(2) provides that either party may request the supply of data relating to the hydrology of the rivers. Article VII, on "Future co-operation",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	referring to earlier, Mr Chairman. Paragraph 7 of Annexure E sets out the "aggregate storage capacity" of reservoirs constructed by India, and these are very small amounts. MR MINEAR: Professor Webb? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Professor Webb. Earlier, on slide 19, you indicated that Kishenganga was initially planned as a storage work. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: And it is on the Jhelum River; is that right? PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. MR MINEAR: What confuses me is on the paragraph 7(c) PROFESSOR WEBB: Apologies, it's on the Neelum. MR MINEAR: Oh, it's on the Neelum. PROFESSOR WEBB: Before it joins the Jhelum. MR MINEAR: The Neelum, yes. Well, is it subject to the power storage capacity limitation set forth in paragraph 7? If it's on the Jhelum, it says "Nil", "Power Storage Capacity". I don't understand how the power storage capacity limitations would allow that at Kishenganga. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. I will have to come back to you. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and reporting requirements. And this takes us back to the preamble of the Treaty that refers to the "cooperative spirit" that is expected of the parties. Now, you have already heard on Monday about how these very detailed cooperation, consultation and information-sharing requirements operate or perhaps do not operate in practice from Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters. And I have provided a handout it's more for your reference; I won't be going through it that provides an overview of each party's rights and obligations under the Treaty. We have Pakistan's rights; Pakistan is also subject to obligations. We have India's rights, and India is also subject to obligations. You will notice the difference in the detail and length of each of those categories. But what is important is: there is no blank column there. The parties are inextricably linked in how they are meant to be cooperating and sharing information throughout the design and operation and construction process. So Article VI(2) provides that either party may request the supply of data relating to the hydrology of the rivers. Article VII, on "Future co-operation",

56 (Pages 205 to 208)

17:02 1	(Slide 31) And VII(2), on the screen, provides that	17:05 1	intended, cooperation between the parties on
2	if either party planned to construct any engineering	2	information-sharing is required from the outset and at
3	work that would "cause interference with the waters of	3	each stage of design, construction and operation. And
4	the Rivers", that would affect the other party	4	if these work as they were intended to work and as
5	"materially", it is obliged to notify the other party of	5	we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner, that is not the
6	its plans. And the party planning the work shall, if	6	case it is supposed to permit the Commissioner to
7	requested, supply data if the work would cause	7	supervise Indian hydroelectric power plant construction
8	interference with the waters, even if it did not	8	and operation so that any issues can be identified early
9	consider that the other party will be materially	9	and resolved in accordance with Article IX.
10	affected.	10	The Kishenganga Court took note of this (PLA-3,
11	So this provision reflects the importance of the	11	paragraphs 443 to 444), saying that:
12	obligation of non-interference. Even if a party does	12	" the Treaty prescribes a formal procedure
13	not think there will be a material effect on the other,	13	designed to bring a measure of order and certainty in
14	there is still an obligation to notify and to start	14	the resolution of competing claims, and to questions of
15	engaging in that process of consultation.	15	propriety of Plant design, before construction
16	(Slide 32) Now, as we know, the most important site	16	commences."
17	for cooperation under the Treaty is the Permanent Indus	17	India's compliance with the unrestricted use, let
18	Commission. This is provided in Article VIII. And it	18	flow, non-interference and no-storage obligation is not
19	is expressed there in paragraph (4) that the purpose and	19	presumed by the Treaty. It is a system of "trust, but
	functions of the Commission are to maintain and		
20 21	establish these "co-operative arrangements" and "promote	20	verify".
		21	(Slide 35) I now come to the question of the Court
22	co-operation" on an ongoing basis.	22	in paragraph 35(b) of Procedural Order No. 6, which is:
23	(Slide 33) And under paragraph 9 of Annexure D,	23	"To what extent can non-Treaty-based design and
24	which was also a provision that Pakistan's Commissioner	24	operational practices be taken into account for purposes
25	took you to, India shall communicate in writing, at	25	of interpreting the technical requirements set out in
	Page 209		Page 211
17:04 1	least six months in advance of the beginning of the	17:07 1	Annexure D, paragraph 8?"
17:04 1 2	construction, very defined information.	17:07 1 2	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design
2 3	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back	2 3	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account
2 3 4	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting	2 3 4	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with
2 3	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and	2 3	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty.
2 3 4	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for	2 3 4 5 6	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The
2 3 4 5 6 7	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the
2 3 4 5 6	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and	2 3 4 5 6	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed. (Slide 34) The implications of gathering all of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we will show in the coming days the language of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed. (Slide 34) The implications of gathering all of this data and information are set out in paragraphs 10, 11	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we will show in the coming days the language of paragraphs 8(d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D. But India
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed. (Slide 34) The implications of gathering all of this data and information are set out in paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of Annexure D, which address the action to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we will show in the coming days the language of paragraphs 8(d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D. But India cannot appeal to extraneous sources, or to so-called
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed. (Slide 34) The implications of gathering all of this data and information are set out in paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of Annexure D, which address the action to be taken if a question arises as to whether a design is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we will show in the coming days the language of paragraphs 8(d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D. But India
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed. (Slide 34) The implications of gathering all of this data and information are set out in paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of Annexure D, which address the action to be taken if a question arises as to whether a design is compliant, and which confirm the ongoing nature of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we will show in the coming days the language of paragraphs 8(d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D. But India cannot appeal to extraneous sources, or to so-called "best practice", without bringing it within those constraints.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed. (Slide 34) The implications of gathering all of this data and information are set out in paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of Annexure D, which address the action to be taken if a question arises as to whether a design is compliant, and which confirm the ongoing nature of the obligation of cooperation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we will show in the coming days the language of paragraphs 8(d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D. But India cannot appeal to extraneous sources, or to so-called "best practice", without bringing it within those constraints. I want to recall pertinent points made by Dr Morris
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed. (Slide 34) The implications of gathering all of this data and information are set out in paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of Annexure D, which address the action to be taken if a question arises as to whether a design is compliant, and which confirm the ongoing nature of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we will show in the coming days the language of paragraphs 8(d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D. But India cannot appeal to extraneous sources, or to so-called "best practice", without bringing it within those constraints.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed. (Slide 34) The implications of gathering all of this data and information are set out in paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of Annexure D, which address the action to be taken if a question arises as to whether a design is compliant, and which confirm the ongoing nature of the obligation of cooperation. So for the provisions of Annexure D to work as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we will show in the coming days the language of paragraphs 8(d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D. But India cannot appeal to extraneous sources, or to so-called "best practice", without bringing it within those constraints. I want to recall pertinent points made by Dr Morris this morning to link the engineering insights with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	construction, very defined information. So as part of the hydro bargain stepping back from the detail of these cooperation and reporting requirements India's design, construction and operation are subject to constant monitoring for compliance with the Treaty. It has to measure a variety of inputs daily and provide the data to Pakistan monthly, or daily if requested. It must inform Pakistan of any planned works likely to affect Pakistan's rights and interests, and provide it with information on them. It has a positive obligation to cooperate with Pakistan on river development and to promote such cooperation through the Commission. And India must also give Pakistan's Commissioner timely access to any facility it builds on the Western Rivers on demand, so that compliance can be assessed. (Slide 34) The implications of gathering all of this data and information are set out in paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of Annexure D, which address the action to be taken if a question arises as to whether a design is compliant, and which confirm the ongoing nature of the obligation of cooperation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Pakistan's position is that non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can only be taken into account to the extent that such practices are consistent with the framework and the object and purpose of the Treaty. This gives India a degree of flexibility. The Treaty does not prescribe the materials with which the spillway gates or the turbines or other components must be constructed. The Treaty does not require that a hydroelectric plant use a desander, or prohibit the use of a desander. The Treaty does not fix the minimum size of outlets by reference to the technological capability of 1960, and it doesn't define what is necessary with respect to sediment control or conditions at site by reference to technology at the time the Treaty was concluded. Non-Treaty-based design and operational practices can be taken into account, including through as we will show in the coming days the language of paragraphs 8(d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D. But India cannot appeal to extraneous sources, or to so-called "best practice", without bringing it within those constraints. I want to recall pertinent points made by Dr Morris

17:08 1 legal framework here. 2 As Dr Morris said, climate change can be taken into 3 account. He explained that engineers design for high, 4 not average, sediment loads. So if climate change will 5 affect the amount of sediment, then you're already 6 designing for that high load. 7 He also said there's always innovations in 8 hydropower engineering, including sediment management, 9 such as turbine coatings. Such innovations are entirely 10 compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they 11 maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the 12 reference, for example, to "sound and economical" 13 design". 14 He also observed that every project has its own 15 little problem, or big problem: physical factors, 16 geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory 17 limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he 18 said, engineers can put their minds to it and the 19 solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, 20 a technique, a change of design or a change of site. 21 As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach 22 to technological advancements or so-called "best 23 practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues 24 by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 25 them briefly to show how that Court took into account 17:11 1 dam site at Gurez to the Line of Control" and to give the Court a full picture of the sensitivity of the triver system". 2 by incorporate a sufficient range of minimum flows so a to give the Court a full picture of the sensitivity of the river system". 2 by out of very respect a sufficient range of minimum flows so a to give the Court a full picture of the sensitivity of the river system". 3 to give the Court a full picture of the sensitivity of the river system". 4 the river system". 5 So underlying the Court's approach was its appreciation that the Treaty required India to operate Kishenganga to preserve the downstream flows. And was informed by the requirement that states "take environmental protection into consideration when planning and d	2 3			
2 As Dr Morris said, climate change can be taken into 3 account. He explained that engineers design for high, 4 not average, sediment loads. So if climate change will 5 affect the amount of sediment, then you're already 6 designing for that high load. 7 He also said there's always innovations in 8 hydropower engineering, including sediment management, 9 such as turbine coatings. Such innovations are entirely 10 compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they 11 maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the 12 reference, for example, to "sound and economical design". 14 He also observed that every project has its own 15 little problem, or big problem: physical factors, 16 geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory 17 limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he 18 said, engineers can put their minds to it and the 29 solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, 20 a technique, a change of design or a change of site. 21 As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach 22 to technological advancements or so-called "best 23 practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues 24 by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 2 infortorate a sufficient range of minimum flows so a togive the Court a full picture of the sensitivity of 4 the river system". 5 So underlying the Court's approach was its 4 the river system". 5 So underlying the Court's approach was its 4 the river system". 6 appreciation that the Treaty required India to operate 8 was informed by the required India to operate 9 environmental protection into consideration when 10 planning and developing projects that may cause injun 11 to a bordering State". 12 The Kishenganga Court wasn't stuck in 1960. It do 12 to a bordering State". 13 upon the International Court of Justice's analysis in 14 the 2010 Pulp Mills judgment, and it emphasised (PL 15 paragraph 450) that an EIA has to be undertaken: 16 industrial activity may have a significant adverse 17 industrial activity may have a significant adverse 1	3	legal framework here.	17:11 1	dam site at Gurez to the Line of Control" and to
account. He explained that engineers design for high, not average, sediment loads. So if climate change will affect the amount of sediment, then you're already designing for that high load. He also said there's always innovations in hydropower engineering, including sediment management, such as turbine coatings. Such innovations are entirely compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the reference, for example, to "sound and economical design". He also observed that every project has its own little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through			2	"incorporate a sufficient range of minimum flows so as
4 not average, sediment loads. So if climate change will 5 affect the amount of sediment, then you're already 6 designing for that high load. 7 He also said there's always innovations in 8 hydropower engineering, including sediment management, 9 such as turbine coatings. Such innovations are entirely 10 compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they 11 maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the 12 reference, for example, to "sound and economical 13 design". 14 He also observed that every project has its own 15 little problem, or big problem: physical factors, 16 geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory 17 limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he 18 said, engineers can put their minds to it and the 19 solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, 20 a technique, a change of design or a change of site. 21 As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach 22 to technological advancements or so-called "best 23 practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues 24 by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through			3	
5 affect the amount of sediment, then you're already 6 designing for that high load. 7 He also said there's always innovations in 8 hydropower engineering, including sediment management, 9 such as turbine coatings. Such innovations are entirely 10 compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they 11 maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the 12 reference, for example, to "sound and economical 13 design". 14 He also observed that every project has its own 15 little problem, or big problem: physical factors, 16 geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory 17 limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he 18 said, engineers can put their minds to it and the 19 solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, 20 a technique, a change of design or a change of site. 21 a we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach 22 to technological advancements or so-called "best 23 practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues 24 by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through				
designing for that high load. He also said there's always innovations in hydropower engineering, including sediment management, such as turbine coatings. Such innovations are entirely compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the reference, for example, to "sound and economical design". He also observed that every project has its own He also observed that every project has its own little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues 24 by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through	5			
He also said there's always innovations in hydropower engineering, including sediment management, such as turbine coatings. Such innovations are entirely compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the reference, for example, to "sound and economical design". He also observed that every project has its own little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through		•		
hydropower engineering, including sediment management, such as turbine coatings. Such innovations are entirely compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the reference, for example, to "sound and economical design". He also observed that every project has its own little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they liphanning and developing projects that may cause injur to a bordering State". The Kishenganga Court wasn't stuck in 1960. It dr upon the International Court of Justice's analysis in the 2010 Pulp Mills judgment, and it emphasised (PL paragraph 450) that an EIA has to be undertaken: " where there is a risk that the proposed industrial activity may have a significant adverse impact in a transboundary context, in particular, on shared resources." It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through				
such as turbine coatings. Such innovations are entirely compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the reference, for example, to "sound and economical design". 12 reference, for example, to "sound and economical design". 13 design". 14 He also observed that every project has its own little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. 12 The Kishenganga Court wasn't stuck in 1960. It dr upon the International Court of Justice's analysis in the 2010 Pulp Mills judgment, and it emphasised (PL. paragraph 450) that an EIA has to be undertaken: " where there is a risk that the proposed industrial activity may have a significant adverse impact in a transboundary context, in particular, on shared resources." 18 said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. 20 It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale construction activities". 21 Expression in the assessment of two issues are construction activities." 22 Expression in the assessment of two issues are construction activities." 23 Practices as such, and				
10 compatible with the Treaty framework, and indeed they 11 maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the 12 reference, for example, to "sound and economical 13 design". 14 He also observed that every project has its own 15 little problem, or big problem: physical factors, 16 geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory 17 limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he 18 said, engineers can put their minds to it and the 19 solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, 20 a technique, a change of design or a change of site. 21 As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach 22 to technological advancements or so-called "best 23 practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues 24 by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 25 to a bordering State". 16 to a bordering State". 17 The Kishenganga Court wasn't stuck in 1960. It dro a bordering State". 18 to a bordering State". 19 to a bordering State". 10 planning and developing projects that may cause injunction abordering State". 11 to a bordering State". 12 The Kishenganga Court wasn't stuck in 1960. It dro upon the International Court of Justice's analysis in the 2010 Pulp Mills judgment, and it emphasised (PL " where there is a risk that the proposed industrial activity may have a significant adverse impact in a transboundary context, in particular, on shared resources." 20 It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale construction activities". 21 construction activities". 22 construction activities".				
maybe be required by the Treaty framework, through the reference, for example, to "sound and economical design". He also observed that every project has its own little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through				
reference, for example, to "sound and economical design". He also observed that every project has its own little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court wasn't stuck in 1960. It drough lit design or John the International Court of Justice's analysis in the 2010 Pulp Mills judgment, and it emphasised (PL. 15 paragraph 450) that an EIA has to be undertaken: " where there is a risk that the proposed industrial activity may have a significant adverse impact in a transboundary context, in particular, on shared resources." It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale construction activities". 22 environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale construction activities".		-		
design". He also observed that every project has its own little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach construction activities" As we stated in the assessment of two issues practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through				_
He also observed that every project has its own little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 14 the 2010 Pulp Mills judgment, and it emphasised (PL. 15 paragraph 450) that an EIA has to be undertaken: 16 " where there is a risk that the proposed 17 industrial activity may have a significant adverse 18 impact in a transboundary context, in particular, on 19 shared resources." 20 It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, 21 and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant 22 environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale 23 construction activities". 24 So it didn't refer to best practices as such, and				
little problem, or big problem: physical factors, geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through		-		-
geological factors, seismic factors and regulatory limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 16 " where there is a risk that the proposed industrial activity may have a significant adverse industrial activity may have a significant adverse 18 impact in a transboundary context, in particular, on 19 shared resources." 20 It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, 21 and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant 22 environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale 23 construction activities". 24 So it didn't refer to best practices as such, and		* * *		
limitations, quite apart from the Treaty. But as he said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 17 industrial activity may have a significant adverse impact in a transboundary context, in particular, on 18 impact in a transboundary context, in particular, on 19 shared resources." 20 It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, 21 and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant 22 environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale 23 construction activities". 24 So it didn't refer to best practices as such, and				
said, engineers can put their minds to it and the solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 18 impact in a transboundary context, in particular, on shared resources." 20 It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant 22 environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale 23 construction activities". 24 So it didn't refer to best practices as such, and				
solutions will come up, whether it's a technology, a technique, a change of design or a change of site. As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 19 shared resources." 20 It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, 21 and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant 22 environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale 23 construction activities". 24 So it didn't refer to best practices as such, and				
20 a technique, a change of design or a change of site. 21 As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach 22 to technological advancements or so-called "best 23 practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues 24 by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 20 It also referred to the 2007 Iron Rhine arbitration, 21 and spoke about the duty to mitigate significant 22 environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale 23 construction activities". 24 So it didn't refer to best practices as such, and				
As we stated in the Memorial, the correct approach to technological advancements or so-called "best practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through		-		
to technological advancements or so-called "best 22 environmental harm "when pursuing large-scale 23 practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues 23 construction activities". 24 by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 24 So it didn't refer to best practices as such, and				
practices" can be seen in the assessment of two issues 23 construction activities". 24 by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 25 construction activities". 26 So it didn't refer to best practices as such, and				
by the Kishenganga Court. And I just want to go through 24 So it didn't refer to best practices as such, and				
		_		
25 them brenty to show how that court took into account 25 certainly not in the way that indian invoked them. Bu				
	23	them offerly to show how that court took into account	2.5	certainly not in the way that inchan invoked them. But
Page 213 Page 215		Page 213		Page 215
	15.10 1		15.10.1	
17:10 1 developments and changing conditions, but without 17:13 1 it did rely on current and promising practices and				
		•		decisions regarding EIAs that informed what the parties
3 Treaty. 3 were required to do under the Treaty.				
		•		The second issue in which this argument about best
5 environmental impact assessments that India had to 5 practices came up was drawdown flushing.		•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				India contended that drawdown flushing was one of
				sustainability of reservoirs, and it cited practices in
				India, Switzerland, Austria, China, New Zealand and
	117			Venezuela. Pakistan responded that sediment sluicing
	11			•
	11 12	LIA DE III WITHING, HIAL IL DE CONQUCIEU SUITICIENTLY		
	11 12 13	-		argument noting that "it is not too the flories to come".
	11 12 13 14	early on to be taken into account in decision-making",		argument, noting that "it is not for the Court to apply
	11 12 13 14 15	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and	15	'best practices'" and I note that the Court put "best
	11 12 13 14 15 16	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this	15 16	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to
	11 12 13 14 15 16	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope	15 16 17	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints
	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope of its EIA.	15 16 17 18	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by India of
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope of its EIA. The Court, faced with these competing arguments,	15 16 17 18 19	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by India of reservoirs" are "a regulatory factor" in plant design,
	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope of its EIA. The Court, faced with these competing arguments, concluded that the evidence did "not provide an adequate	15 16 17 18 19 20	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by India of reservoirs" are "a regulatory factor" in plant design, such that the Treaty prohibited drawdown flushing
-	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope of its EIA. The Court, faced with these competing arguments, concluded that the evidence did "not provide an adequate basis" for the determination of the "maintenance of	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by India of reservoirs" are "a regulatory factor" in plant design, such that the Treaty prohibited drawdown flushing (PLA-3, paragraph 522).
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope of its EIA. The Court, faced with these competing arguments, concluded that the evidence did "not provide an adequate basis" for the determination of the "maintenance of minimum flow downstream of the KHEP". It requested	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by India of reservoirs" are "a regulatory factor" in plant design, such that the Treaty prohibited drawdown flushing (PLA-3, paragraph 522). So the Court again did not accept the mere
	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope of its EIA. The Court, faced with these competing arguments, concluded that the evidence did "not provide an adequate basis" for the determination of the "maintenance of minimum flow downstream of the KHEP". It requested India to provide "further data concerning the impacts of	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by India of reservoirs" are "a regulatory factor" in plant design, such that the Treaty prohibited drawdown flushing (PLA-3, paragraph 522). So the Court again did not accept the mere invocation of best practice to circumvent the Treaty
23 Engineering practices and innovations that are with	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope of its EIA. The Court, faced with these competing arguments, concluded that the evidence did "not provide an adequate basis" for the determination of the "maintenance of minimum flow downstream of the KHEP". It requested India to provide "further data concerning the impacts of a range of minimum flows to be discharged" at	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by India of reservoirs" are "a regulatory factor" in plant design, such that the Treaty prohibited drawdown flushing (PLA-3, paragraph 522). So the Court again did not accept the mere invocation of best practice to circumvent the Treaty requirements. But it was still very much open to
Page 214 Page 216	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope of its EIA. The Court, faced with these competing arguments, concluded that the evidence did "not provide an adequate basis" for the determination of the "maintenance of minimum flow downstream of the KHEP". It requested India to provide "further data concerning the impacts of	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by India of reservoirs" are "a regulatory factor" in plant design, such that the Treaty prohibited drawdown flushing (PLA-3, paragraph 522). So the Court again did not accept the mere invocation of best practice to circumvent the Treaty
	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	early on to be taken into account in decision-making", that it "include an opportunity for public comment", and that it "be comprehensive". And it tried to use this invocation of best practices to avoid defining the scope of its EIA. The Court, faced with these competing arguments, concluded that the evidence did "not provide an adequate basis" for the determination of the "maintenance of minimum flow downstream of the KHEP". It requested India to provide "further data concerning the impacts of a range of minimum flows to be discharged" at Kishenganga, including "environmental concerns from the	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"best practices" and I note that the Court put "best practices" in quotation marks; it was not resistant to a real best practice and that "the Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by India of reservoirs" are "a regulatory factor" in plant design, such that the Treaty prohibited drawdown flushing (PLA-3, paragraph 522). So the Court again did not accept the mere invocation of best practice to circumvent the Treaty requirements. But it was still very much open to engineering practices and innovations that are within

58 (Pages 213 to 216)

17.14	1	the Treety fremoverk	17:17 1	a manner consistent with its object and purpose. As
17:14	1 2	the Treaty framework. In its approach to the interpretation of the Treaty,	17:17 1	Dr Morris said, the Treaty is focused on sustaining the
	3	and the hydro bargain in particular, India tends to turn	3	hydrology coming in to Pakistan. That is its object.
		Article III on its head. It tends to take a narrow	4	The peace treaty and hydro bargains that were struck
	4	approach to the rule in Article III and an expansive	5	after years of negotiation, and with the assistance of
	5	approach to the exceptions also within Article III and		the World Bank, was not an agreement for a fixed period.
	6	as set out in Annexure D.	6	-
	7 8		7 8	It wasn't an agreement that allowed for unilateral revision, or for reassessment through a continuously
		India is motivated by its plan to "harness[] the significant hydro-electric potential available on the	9	available process. It was meant to be stable and
	9	Western Rivers", as it has stated. I'm citing its	10	secure, and underpinned by cooperation and goodwill.
	10	Rejoinder in the Kishenganga arbitration, which is our	11	That concludes my submissions. I'm very happy to
	11		11	
	12	Exhibit P-0227, at paragraph 4.97.	13	take any questions, or we might have an early night. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear?
	13	And to this end, motivated by desire, India tries to		
	14	characterise the object and purpose of the Treaty as the	14 15	(5.18 pm)
	15	utilisation of waters, as I showed you yesterday.		Questions from THE COURT MR MINEAR: Thank you, Professor Webb.
	16	It only reads the first part of the preamble, and it	16	
	17	overlooks the second part of the preamble, speaking of	17	I want to return to my question earlier about
	18	the: " fixing and delimiting in a spirit of goodwill	18	
	19	" fixing and delimiting, in a spirit of goodwill and friendship, the rights and obligations of each in	19	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	20		20 21	to my own satisfaction myself. I briefly said: the
	21 22	relation to the other concerning the use of these waters."	21 22	Neelum is a tributary of the Jhelum, and so therefore it would fall within 7(b). If I'm mistaken about that,
	23		23	please inform me later.
	23 24	In Ms Rees-Evans's exchange with Mr Minear yesterday, she confirmed that the Treaty does not limit	23	PROFESSOR WEBB: I will.
	25	the number of plants or the amount of power that India	25	MR MINEAR: But I'd like to relieve you of the work of
	23	the number of plants of the amount of power that fitth	23	WIN WITH LAN. But I'd like to refleve you of the work of
		Page 217		Page 219
17:16	1	can generate on the Western Rivers. But a limit is	17:18 1	trying to correct
17.10	2	there because it comes in through the criteria in	2	PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you for the steer.
	3	paragraph 8 of Annexure D.	3	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert?
	4	India has interpreted each requirement in Annexure D	4	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.
	5	so as to maximise its ability to control and manipulate	5	I'm afraid I will bring you back to the table that
	6	the waters through the design and operation of	6	you showed on your slide 27 about Annexure E. I know
	7	hydroelectric plants. And as we've heard already, the	7	the second secon
	8	Kishenganga plant and the Ratle plant are just examples		you've answered a previous question to the Chairman
		Trishenganga plant and the Tracte plant are just examples	8	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me.
	9	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features	9	• •
	9 10			about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me.
		of the standard Indian HEP design with common features	9	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage
	10	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants.	9 10	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would
	10 11	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art"	9 10 11	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants.
	10 11 12	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and	9 10 11 12	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the
	10 11 12 13	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality,	9 10 11 12 13	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to?
	10 11 12 13 14	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their	9 10 11 12 13 14	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from
	10 11 12 13 14 15	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has	9 10 11 12 13 14	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify
	10 11 12 13 14 15	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that?
	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty. (Slide 37) So I come back to the rule and the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, I think if that's your answer, my follow-up question would be: what kind of power storage work is permitted under the Treaty?
	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty. (Slide 37) So I come back to the rule and the exception. The correct interpretative approach is to	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, I think if that's your answer, my follow-up question would be: what kind of power storage
	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty. (Slide 37) So I come back to the rule and the exception. The correct interpretative approach is to treat Article III as the rule, and to restrictively	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, I think if that's your answer, my follow-up question would be: what kind of power storage work is permitted under the Treaty?
	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty. (Slide 37) So I come back to the rule and the exception. The correct interpretative approach is to treat Article III as the rule, and to restrictively interpret, according to the ordinary meaning and the object and purpose, the exceptions in Article III(2) and Annexure D.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, I think if that's your answer, my follow-up question would be: what kind of power storage work is permitted under the Treaty? PROFESSOR WEBB: I will come back to you on that as well. Thank you. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.
	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty. (Slide 37) So I come back to the rule and the exception. The correct interpretative approach is to treat Article III as the rule, and to restrictively interpret, according to the ordinary meaning and the object and purpose, the exceptions in Article III(2) and Annexure D. This reflects the bargain at the heart of the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, I think if that's your answer, my follow-up question would be: what kind of power storage work is permitted under the Treaty? PROFESSOR WEBB: I will come back to you on that as well. Thank you. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: So I just have one question, and then we'll
	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty. (Slide 37) So I come back to the rule and the exception. The correct interpretative approach is to treat Article III as the rule, and to restrictively interpret, according to the ordinary meaning and the object and purpose, the exceptions in Article III(2) and Annexure D. This reflects the bargain at the heart of the Treaty. This approach requires that any best practices	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, I think if that's your answer, my follow-up question would be: what kind of power storage work is permitted under the Treaty? PROFESSOR WEBB: I will come back to you on that as well. Thank you. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: So I just have one question, and then we'll let you and everyone go.
	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty. (Slide 37) So I come back to the rule and the exception. The correct interpretative approach is to treat Article III as the rule, and to restrictively interpret, according to the ordinary meaning and the object and purpose, the exceptions in Article III(2) and Annexure D. This reflects the bargain at the heart of the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, I think if that's your answer, my follow-up question would be: what kind of power storage work is permitted under the Treaty? PROFESSOR WEBB: I will come back to you on that as well. Thank you. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: So I just have one question, and then we'll
	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty. (Slide 37) So I come back to the rule and the exception. The correct interpretative approach is to treat Article III as the rule, and to restrictively interpret, according to the ordinary meaning and the object and purpose, the exceptions in Article III(2) and Annexure D. This reflects the bargain at the heart of the Treaty. This approach requires that any best practices are adopted within the framework of the Treaty, and in	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, I think if that's your answer, my follow-up question would be: what kind of power storage work is permitted under the Treaty? PROFESSOR WEBB: I will come back to you on that as well. Thank you. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: So I just have one question, and then we'll let you and everyone go.
	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the standard Indian HEP design with common features that is being replicated in dozens of plants. India purports to adopt a "state-of-the-art" approach in order to circumvent the design and operational restrictions in Annexure D. But in reality, its designs are not state of the art, including their sole focus on empty flushing, as Dr Morris has explained, while also being in violation of the Treaty. (Slide 37) So I come back to the rule and the exception. The correct interpretative approach is to treat Article III as the rule, and to restrictively interpret, according to the ordinary meaning and the object and purpose, the exceptions in Article III(2) and Annexure D. This reflects the bargain at the heart of the Treaty. This approach requires that any best practices	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	about this, but it wasn't entirely clear to me. In the second column here, so the "power storage capacity", I think you mentioned that Annexure E would not be applicable to run-of-river hydroelectric plants. So I wonder then: what kind of power production does the second column here refer to? PROFESSOR WEBB: I think that is power production from a storage work. But can I come back to you to clarify that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, I think if that's your answer, my follow-up question would be: what kind of power storage work is permitted under the Treaty? PROFESSOR WEBB: I will come back to you on that as well. Thank you. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: So I just have one question, and then we'll let you and everyone go. I was particularly interested in the last part of

17:20 1	your presentation, where you were answering that	17:23 1	we will study the transcript closely. I just give two
2	question that we had in paragraph 35(b). One could	2	reactions now.
3	focus in on that particular question, which is about	3	On your third point, that Treaty rights and
4	practices. But I'm wondering if one can look at this	4	obligations are informed by customary international law
5	a little bit more holistically, as to where in the	5	but not negated by it, I would add in there the
6	overall scheme of sources of law, or practices, one	6	necessity criterion from paragraph 29, Annexure G. So
7	might see a progression of reasoning that should take	7	it's not just a test of: this doesn't negate what the
8	place in any given instance.	8	Treaty says. To enter that gateway of customary
9	So let me read out to you what I discerned from your	9	international law or other conventional law, it has to
10	Memorial. And I don't expect you to answer this now,	10	be necessary.
11	but it may be something worth pondering overnight and in	11	And on your fifth point, that there's discretion in
12	the days to come. It seems to me that maybe Pakistan is	12	design and operation if it's not issues falling within
13	advancing the following five steps as the sequence for	13	treaty or customary international law, I would add: the
14	applying sources of law or practices.	14	spirit of the Treaty, and also the role of the
15	First, the Treaty's specific requirements in all	15	Commission, even in that instance, that there be
16	instances must be observed.	16	data-sharing, consultation, visits and so on.
17	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes.	17	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. In that case, there are perhaps
18	THE CHAIRMAN: So, for example, don't use best practices to	18	ways you'd want to massage the scheme I presented to
19	negate a specific Treaty requirement, such as perhaps on	19	you, and that's precisely why I put it to you not as
20	drawdown flushing.	20	an immediate response but a response in due course.
21	Second, those Treaty requirements sometimes allow	21	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, and we will reflect on that,
22	for construction of a hydroelectric plant on the Western	22	thank you.
23	Rivers by India with reference to design or customary or	23	THE CHAIRMAN: I think we don't have any further questions
23	accepted practices; and I know we'll be talking about	23	for you. But thank you, Professor Webb. Your
		25	
25	that tomorrow. But this will often depend on	23	presentation was very helpful.
	Page 221		Page 223
17:22 1	a plant-by-plant analysis, such as the materials you	17:25 1	I'll turn to Sir Daniel. I think we are probably
17:22 1 2	a plant-by-plant analysis, such as the materials you would use to construct a spillway gate, or something	17:25 1 2	I'll turn to Sir Daniel. I think we are probably done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless
			* *
2	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something	2	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless
2 3	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that.	2 3	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume
2 3 4	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and	2 3 4	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning.
2 3 4 5	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by,	2 3 4 5	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's
2 3 4 5 6	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that	2 3 4 5 6	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence
2 3 4 5 6 7	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international	2 3 4 5 6 7	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place the propositions that were advanced in the Memorial.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place the propositions that were advanced in the Memorial. I may have got them right, I may have got them wrong.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place the propositions that were advanced in the Memorial. I may have got them right, I may have got them wrong. But I'd be interested in hearing from Pakistan at some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place the propositions that were advanced in the Memorial. I may have got them right, I may have got them wrong. But I'd be interested in hearing from Pakistan at some point a gathering-together of these various sources in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place the propositions that were advanced in the Memorial. I may have got them right, I may have got them wrong. But I'd be interested in hearing from Pakistan at some point a gathering-together of these various sources in a way that might allow for a progression of analytical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place the propositions that were advanced in the Memorial. I may have got them right, I may have got them wrong. But I'd be interested in hearing from Pakistan at some point a gathering-together of these various sources in a way that might allow for a progression of analytical reasoning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place the propositions that were advanced in the Memorial. I may have got them right, I may have got them wrong. But I'd be interested in hearing from Pakistan at some point a gathering-together of these various sources in a way that might allow for a progression of analytical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place the propositions that were advanced in the Memorial. I may have got them right, I may have got them wrong. But I'd be interested in hearing from Pakistan at some point a gathering-together of these various sources in a way that might allow for a progression of analytical reasoning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	would use to construct a spillway gate, or something like that. Third, it's possible for Treaty rights and obligations to be informed by, but not negated by, customary international law. So an example of that would be the Kishenganga use of international environmental law, as you just discussed to us. Fourth, on an issue not regulated by the Treaty, the parties are still bound by other treaties to which they are a party and customary international law. I think that probably then falls to a large extent outside the scope of the Treaty. And then fifth, on issues not regulated by any treaty or customary international law, the parties have discretion in the design and operation of the hydroelectric plants. This is my attempt to pull together into one place the propositions that were advanced in the Memorial. I may have got them right, I may have got them wrong. But I'd be interested in hearing from Pakistan at some point a gathering-together of these various sources in a way that might allow for a progression of analytical reasoning. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes, thank you. That's very helpful, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	done for the day, and relatively caught up. So unless there's other business, we will end the day and resume tomorrow morning. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that's absolutely right, and I'm grateful for your indulgence over the coffee break. I hope that there was no self-denying ordinance on the part of the members of the Court in terms of asking questions, but no doubt otherwise we will get them in a flood on Saturday. And we are caught up in terms of timing, so we will start again tomorrow, and we are almost within sight of the pinnacle. THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. We'll see you at 9.30 then. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (5.26 pm) (The hearing adjourned until 9.30 am the following day)

60 (Pages 221 to 224)

	ı	1			
A	142:9 151:1 154:9	Adjusted 187:4	200:18 202:16,19	although 68:23 90:6	209:23 210:21,25
ABDULLAH 2:12	159:21	adjusting 85:11	204:13,20 205:13	163:9 203:20	212:1,20 217:7
	acknowledgement	108:16	216:22 224:12	always 3:12 33:24	218:3,4,13,22
ability 71:8 78:13,13	155:5	adjustment 84:15	against 18:7 44:23	48:15,22 86:15	219:18 220:6,10
78:14,18,23 85:16	acknowledges 10:1	108:14	103:16 116:19	109:6 129:23 213:7	223:6
95:10,11 99:16	across 9:18 49:12 79:5	adopt 120:8 132:25	119:7 154:16	AL-KHASAWNEH	annexures 184:12
100:10 104:9	97:18 138:12 156:4	218:11	155:12 156:9	1:10	189:23 191:3,15
142:22 154:20	act 188:10 207:22,23	adopted 128:21 155:4	159:19 164:22	Ambassador 2:6	193:17 196:12
166:9 218:5	action 20:1 207:20	175:15 218:25	agencies 44:4,5,6,9	ambitious 104:7	205:17
able 16:2 33:23 42:24	210:21	adopting 174:25	agency 44:9 85:23	amenable 14:13	announced 103:20
46:11 50:10 57:17	actions 45:10 207:16	adopting 174.23		amended 162:23	annual 27:22 30:8
59:25 60:13 62:23	active 110:19		aggregate 206:3		
71:10 75:14 78:17		advance 8:23 198:11	aggregating 81:12	America 27:20 103:19	annually 111:17
82:17 83:22 95:23	activities 41:2 215:23	210:1	ago 13:15 21:9,9 30:24	110:14	another 3:5 22:7,9
96:10 98:6 101:11	activity 15:17 16:8	advanced 222:19	45:3 58:20,20 59:17	American 50:12	23:23 33:18 39:1
107:6 110:24	215:17	advancements 213:22	103:22 111:20	among 136:4 175:8	52:25 54:8 55:3,4
132:25 184:16	actual 137:14	advances 51:15 65:12	158:21	amount 19:15 24:12	73:11 97:3 99:16
191:13,21 202:23	actually 4:13 6:10	advancing 221:13	agree 44:6 141:5	30:21 45:16 68:10	106:21 116:9
203:12	13:4,7 21:12 26:2	advantage 42:9,25	187:5	69:5 75:16,23 76:11	120:19 146:5 174:2
above 190:22 199:4,16	26:20 44:24 63:20	90:18 110:1 203:19	agreed 133:21 174:23	77:15,17 89:9 95:9	answer 19:11,12,13
199:18	71:20 72:16 76:4	203:20	agreement 47:1	99:15 100:24	32:11 57:23 58:10
abrasion 37:9	83:10 86:8,20 88:18	advantages 29:20 43:1	180:17 187:15	108:11 110:6	58:16 59:6 107:15
abrupt 96:17 99:5	89:12 93:19 95:23	51:10	190:12 208:25	113:25 185:14	113:13,14 138:20
abruptly 97:10	96:10 97:23 99:11	adverse 157:17 203:25	219:6,7	204:13 205:10	154:4 164:13
absence 168:11	108:10 111:21	215:17	agreements 184:23	213:5 217:25	188:25 191:25
202:17	154:7 162:18	Advisor 2:5,13,14	agricultural 14:6	amounts 206:5	220:17 221:10
absolutely 170:15	170:19 191:2	advocated 112:15	205:7	amplified 108:8	answered 139:16
224:6	201:20	Affairs 2:5	ahead 32:3	analogous 77:2 149:17	219:19 220:7
accelerated 14:25	adapt 13:17	affect 59:14 70:24	Aide 186:25	analysed 148:21	answering 221:1
170:13	adaptations 13:25	103:15 209:4	air 11:4	analyses 77:20	answers 119:25
accelerates 14:8 64:19	adaptive 13:18	210:11 213:5	Alberta 103:20,23	analysing 72:15	138:25 170:19,20
accept 216:22	add 11:20 72:12 74:19	affected 26:3 54:5	ALI 2:4	185:16	anticipate 103:7,9,17
accepted 106:17	79:17 104:19 223:5	55:4 56:3 93:5	aligns 134:11	analysis 6:14 75:8	111:12 163:9
129:14 187:10	223:13	165:22 209:10	allocate 48:24	88:21 94:11 112:3	anticipating 59:18
216:13 221:24	added 74:17,22,25	affects 50:1 89:25	allocated 185:24	117:5 135:15	anything 4:5 34:3
access 62:1 210:16	76:2	101:12 108:11	allocates 48:25	138:11 145:25	36:20 49:6 95:3
accompanied 141:13	addition 77:25 89:24	110:12	allow 4:5 68:21 83:23	215:13 222:1	108:13 181:10
143:18 145:8	202:6 205:2	affirmatively 132:6	85:2 93:11 162:23	analytical 222:23	198:21
accord 164:8	additional 3:8 47:4	affirms 189:4	169:21 206:23	Anchicayá 45:2	anyway 19:13 46:14
accordance 140:11	74:5 94:8 202:11	afflux 188:18	221:21 222:23	ancillary 70:23 78:11	anyways 100:2
144:2 146:1 159:6	additions 90:13	afford 55:19 186:25	allowed 179:21 219:7	79:7,11,15,17,19,23	anywhere 45:13 78:19
180:18 183:10	address 2:24 3:1 5:13	affordable 73:6	allowing 90:20 191:7	83:4,9,11,21 84:6	apart 194:10 213:17
211:9	6:17,23 8:1 75:11	Afghanistan 41:10	allows 19:7 29:6 31:25	85:17 86:17 94:10	apologies 115:14
accorded 5:18 151:4	112:10 116:1,10	afraid 220:5	69:25 75:6 84:14	99:2 100:16,20,24	206:15
184:3	122:12,19 125:4	after 2:16 18:11 30:21	92:13 110:1	101:8 102:2,8,19	apologise 122:5
according 149:7	139:18,25 143:12	39:12 45:11 59:19	almost 61:5 68:8 79:6	103:10 104:10,11	apparent 3:12 117:13
218:20	173:11 183:20	60:12 74:4 78:25	89:19 97:23 106:19	angle 36:17,17	117:22
accordingly 120:24	191:21 210:21	91:5 114:10,14	168:21 224:12	Annex 124:19	appeal 212:21
accordingly 120:24 accords 162:11 163:6	addressed 3:4 7:10	119:24 127:6 133:9	alone 186:17	annexure 1:1 7:15	appear 8:5 145:14
164:21,24	13:1,2 55:22 121:24	137:11 155:3 219:5	along 17:15 42:17	8:19 10:12,15	APPEARANCES 2:1
account 46:23 68:1	122:1,2 124:3 150:1	afternoon 4:8 114:1	56:15 61:15 69:1	124:17 135:7,18,24	appeared 113:3
136:11 211:24		115:7	106:24 115:7	136:11 140:8,12	187:14
 130.11 / 111/74 	151:17 165:13				
	168:17 171:15	afterthought 185:17	162:11 167:8	141:3 142:6 144:3	appears 75:17 126:14
212:3,18 213:3,25		afterthought 185:17 afterwards 170:25	162:11 167:8 alongside 171:12		
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14	168:17 171:15			141:3 142:6 144:3	appears 75:17 126:14
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5	afterwards 170:25	alongside 171:12	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25	alongside 171:12 182:11	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16 accumulation 152:14	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20 182:23 198:12	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15 118:6 119:20 128:3	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3 159:9 168:7 186:7	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23 192:25 193:1,11,16	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25 118:3,5,11 121:7,22
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16 accumulation 152:14 accustomed 51:4	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20 182:23 198:12 adequate 214:20	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15 118:6 119:20 128:3 128:21 130:5,9	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3 159:9 168:7 186:7 196:11 198:19	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23 192:25 193:1,11,16 194:14,22,24	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25 118:3,5,11 121:7,22 122:14 123:12
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16 accumulation 152:14 accustomed 51:4 achieve 14:14 36:10	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20 182:23 198:12 adequate 214:20 adjourned 115:12	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15 118:6 119:20 128:3 128:21 130:5,9 138:7 142:11,13	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3 159:9 168:7 186:7 196:11 198:19 208:5 213:5 218:7	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23 192:25 193:1,11,16 194:14,22,24 195:19,22,23 196:1	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25 118:3,5,11 121:7,22 122:14 123:12 124:10 134:22
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16 accumulation 152:14 accustomed 51:4 achieve 14:14 36:10 72:3	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20 182:23 198:12 adequate 214:20 adjourned 115:12 224:17	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15 118:6 119:20 128:3 128:21 130:5,9 138:7 142:11,13 146:10 155:10	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3 159:9 168:7 186:7 196:11 198:19 208:5 213:5 218:7 Alright 115:6	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23 192:25 193:1,11,16 194:14,22,24 195:19,22,23 196:1 196:18,20,23	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25 118:3,5,11 121:7,22 122:14 123:12 124:10 134:22 135:3 137:3,25
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16 accumulation 152:14 accustomed 51:4 achieve 14:14 36:10 72:3 achieved 175:13	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20 182:23 198:12 adequate 214:20 adjourned 115:12 224:17 adjudication 147:8,9	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15 118:6 119:20 128:3 128:21 130:5,9 138:7 142:11,13 146:10 155:10 156:2 176:4 177:17	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3 159:9 168:7 186:7 196:11 198:19 208:5 213:5 218:7 Alright 115:6 alter 49:7 186:5	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23 192:25 193:1,11,16 194:14,22,24 195:19,22,23 196:1 196:18,20,23 197:11,13,17,19,23	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25 118:3,5,11 121:7,22 122:14 123:12 124:10 134:22 135:3 137:3,25 140:17,22 144:6,15
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16 accumulation 152:14 accustomed 51:4 achieve 14:14 36:10 72:3 achieved 175:13 200:11	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20 182:23 198:12 adequate 214:20 adjourned 115:12 224:17 adjudication 147:8,9 150:22,24	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15 118:6 119:20 128:3 128:21 130:5,9 138:7 142:11,13 146:10 155:10 156:2 176:4 177:17 184:5,9,20 189:9,24	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3 159:9 168:7 186:7 196:11 198:19 208:5 213:5 218:7 Alright 115:6 alter 49:7 186:5 alternative 33:25	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23 192:25 193:1,11,16 194:14,22,24 195:19,22,23 196:1 196:18,20,23 197:11,13,17,19,23 198:8,17,19,20	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25 118:3,5,11 121:7,22 122:14 123:12 124:10 134:22 135:3 137:3,25 140:17,22 144:6,15 152:1 154:2,14,18
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16 accumulation 152:14 accustomed 51:4 achieve 14:14 36:10 72:3 achieved 175:13 200:11 acknowledge 155:2	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20 182:23 198:12 adequate 214:20 adjourned 115:12 224:17 adjudication 147:8,9	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15 118:6 119:20 128:3 128:21 130:5,9 138:7 142:11,13 146:10 155:10 156:2 176:4 177:17 184:5,9,20 189:9,24 191:4 192:11	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3 159:9 168:7 186:7 196:11 198:19 208:5 213:5 218:7 Alright 115:6 alter 49:7 186:5 alternative 33:25 115:2 216:11	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23 192:25 193:1,11,16 194:14,22,24 195:19,22,23 196:1 196:18,20,23 197:11,13,17,19,23 198:8,17,19,20 199:4 200:22,25	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25 118:3,5,11 121:7,22 122:14 123:12 124:10 134:22 135:3 137:3,25 140:17,22 144:6,15 152:1 154:2,14,18 154:23 155:3
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16 accumulation 152:14 accustomed 51:4 achieve 14:14 36:10 72:3 achieved 175:13 200:11	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20 182:23 198:12 adequate 214:20 adjourned 115:12 224:17 adjudication 147:8,9 150:22,24 adjust 82:20 83:2	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15 118:6 119:20 128:3 128:21 130:5,9 138:7 142:11,13 146:10 155:10 156:2 176:4 177:17 184:5,9,20 189:9,24	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3 159:9 168:7 186:7 196:11 198:19 208:5 213:5 218:7 Alright 115:6 alter 49:7 186:5 alternative 33:25	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23 192:25 193:1,11,16 194:14,22,24 195:19,22,23 196:1 196:18,20,23 197:11,13,17,19,23 198:8,17,19,20	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25 118:3,5,11 121:7,22 122:14 123:12 124:10 134:22 135:3 137:3,25 140:17,22 144:6,15 152:1 154:2,14,18
212:3,18 213:3,25 214:14 accounts 198:24 accumulate 28:16,18 48:1 77:12 accumulated 20:16 75:16 accumulating 28:15 59:16 accumulation 152:14 accustomed 51:4 achieve 14:14 36:10 72:3 achieved 175:13 200:11 acknowledge 155:2	168:17 171:15 172:1,7 190:9 195:5 197:23 addresses 150:5 168:7 171:16 192:21 addressing 2:14,17 7:23 32:7 130:20 138:19 150:12 159:13 172:20 182:23 198:12 adequate 214:20 adjourned 115:12 224:17 adjudication 147:8,9 150:22,24 adjust 82:20 83:2	afterwards 170:25 again 1:4 5:12 10:25 29:9 38:7,7 39:6 51:24 56:1,13 67:12 68:23 79:1 81:5,9 84:8 85:13 87:8 88:25 89:2 111:11 114:14 115:15 118:6 119:20 128:3 128:21 130:5,9 138:7 142:11,13 146:10 155:10 156:2 176:4 177:17 184:5,9,20 189:9,24 191:4 192:11	alongside 171:12 182:11 already 3:4 4:18 20:6 20:12 48:20 84:20 100:4 121:16,18 122:16 123:17,18 123:20 149:11 157:3,4,18 158:3 159:9 168:7 186:7 196:11 198:19 208:5 213:5 218:7 Alright 115:6 alter 49:7 186:5 alternative 33:25 115:2 216:11	141:3 142:6 144:3 157:7 160:22,23 167:21 172:15 173:9,13,20,24 174:5 178:5,6 179:14 180:10 183:11 191:6,9,13 191:15,19 192:4,5,7 192:9,12,16,18,23 192:25 193:1,11,16 194:14,22,24 195:19,22,23 196:1 196:18,20,23 197:11,13,17,19,23 198:8,17,19,20 199:4 200:22,25	appears 75:17 126:14 146:24 appendix 187:2 applicable 124:25 143:8 146:20 167:22 169:2,7 192:8 220:11 application 6:15 75:2 75:12 117:19,25 118:3,5,11 121:7,22 122:14 123:12 124:10 134:22 135:3 137:3,25 140:17,22 144:6,15 152:1 154:2,14,18 154:23 155:3

	Ī				
159:8 162:17,23	49:18 55:4,24 56:12	146:13,14 169:7	121:18,25 122:1,7	124:16,19,23	batteries 69:5,6 91:20
163:12 168:23	62:4 69:24 86:1,4,5	182:11	123:23 125:15	125:10,18,24,25	95:13 97:19 106:24
194:13	88:25 89:6 90:2	asserting 120:12	132:15,18,22,23	126:2,8,12,25	110:4
applied 13:4 149:22	98:2 106:15 205:10	125:24	140:10 141:8,12,19	127:14 128:3,6,10	battery 79:9 96:16
149:23	214:8.9				97:21,23 104:2
	, .	asserts 126:2,8	141:19,20,20,21,23	128:14,17 129:8,11	-
applies 137:18 141:19	areas 14:16 21:15	assess 148:23	142:16,22,24	129:20,23 130:3,9	bear 1:23
147:24 159:2	27:20 51:13 55:14	assessed 210:18	143:14,15,18,20,22	130:14,23 131:5,11	bearing 131:21
185:19	55:15 93:22 187:5	assessing 155:16	144:1,8,11,12,23	132:1,21 133:1	beautiful 38:22,23
apply 3:21 10:22	arguably 165:25	assessment 72:6	145:3,7,9,12,13,23	135:12 136:20,22	become 63:10 70:7
25:11 32:17 46:7	argue 177:16 185:20	213:23	146:7,15,25 147:2	137:19 157:13,14	becomes 61:25 74:8
153:2 156:24 157:2	argued 112:13	assessments 214:5	147:21 150:4 151:2	161:17 174:19,24	109:4
160:13,18 163:19	arguing 176:17,19	assistance 160:2 219:5	151:9,22,23 152:25	175:16,21,23 176:4	becoming 111:20,21
164:7 167:3 172:4	argument 194:19	Assistant 2:20	154:13,15 155:6,11	176:17,22 177:1,11	bed 26:18,25 27:5,8,8
173:2 175:3,16	214:7,11 216:4,14	associated 63:7 65:14	156:12,18,20 157:1	177:18,22,25 178:9	35:16 59:23,23
178:9 216:14	arguments 214:19	66:18 72:24 75:12	157:4,19 159:7	181:11,17,18,19	beds 47:25 48:1
applying 167:23,24	arise 120:24 121:2	127:7 185:22	161:18,19,20,23	182:4,9	bed-load 35:16
221:14	140:15 173:13	192:17	162:1 163:14,24	Bajo 45:2	before 1:9 1:14 2:4
appointed 172:10	180:16 200:23	assume 109:21 111:14	164:4,8 166:20	balance 59:19 189:17	5:25 15:14 16:18
appointment 117:9	arisen 124:14	132:18	167:8,15 171:13	189:20	19:4 20:1,4 60:11
apportioning 49:23	arises 117:7 118:17	assuming 33:19,20	172:8 174:14,22	balancing 72:11	64:11 86:25 91:8,12
apportions 49:3	171:24 174:8	assumptions 75:8	175:16,19 177:21	Bank 186:25 187:4,9	116:11 117:7,13,23
appreciable 26:7 60:3	210:22	assumptions 75.8 assured 19:4 75:23	200:8 201:12	191:5 219:6	117:25 118:4,5,12
appreciate 5:23 8:3	arising 171:10 199:10	76:5.8	awards 119:4 120:11	banks 40:2	118:16,22 119:2,8
* *		, .			
11:10,13 65:4	Army 44:2	Aswan 19:19	123:7,16 125:8,12	bank-financed 38:10	119:18 120:19,22
182:16	around 8:18,21 9:16	attach 6:24	126:15 127:6 131:7	48:14	127:8 130:16 133:7
appreciated 1:10	13:24 16:21 17:23	attaches 147:3	137:20 141:7,24	bargain 3:24 2:25	133:22 134:9 137:7
appreciates 177:5	25:24 26:12 61:13	attempt 3:13,15 146:5	150:18 157:9	8:14,16,16 155:15	138:15 143:10
appreciation 68:17	69:5 70:6 83:19	154:20 222:18	161:10 162:15	155:19 182:21,24	147:11 148:23
72:17 215:6	93:1 94:3 98:19	attempting 125:19	168:8,13 178:18	183:1,7,18 184:1	153:20 154:25
approach 10:25 50:14	103:8 110:9 158:10	attention 55:12	award's 156:1	185:23 186:10	156:23 162:16
109:14 123:24	165:13 168:21	133:16	aware 11:21 132:19	189:10,25 192:3	167:19 169:18,21
128:22 136:3	189:3 195:14	ATTILA 2:11	away 7:17 18:1,10	197:4 200:3,14	169:22 170:11,22
165:16 174:24	arrangements 109:2	Attorney 2:6	27:11 155:4 177:19	202:18 205:14	171:9,10,18 179:2
213:21 215:5 217:2	209:21	attribution 10:11	AWN 1:10	207:25 210:3 217:3	181:3 206:17
217:5,6 218:12,18	arrived 28:3	August 187:11 190:10	axis 83:17 86:2,8	218:23	211:15
210,24					
218:24	arriving 53:20 72:13	190:17	88:24,25 201:14	bargains 8:15 219:4	begin 11:3
approaching 4:10	arriving 53:20 72:13 art 195:12 218:14	190:17 Austria 216:9	88:24,25 201:14 A3 116:9	bargains 8:15 219:4 barrage 19:2,3	begin 11:3 beginning 50:20 57:3
approaching 4:10 35:3				S	O
approaching 4:10 35:3	art 195:12 218:14	Austria 216:9		barrage 19:2,3	beginning 50:20 57:3
approaching 4:10	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4	A3 116:9	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1	A3 116:9 B b 28:2 122:12 183:20	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14	A3 116:9 B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25	A3 116:9 B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9	A3 116:9 B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9	A3 116:9 B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 178:17 179:16,18	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basins 70:10,11	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 178:17 179:16,18 179:22 180:2,7,24	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13 aside 160:8	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5 average 48:22 76:4	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15 7:10 37:5,8 46:7,10	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basins 70:10,11 200:15	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11 152:22 154:21
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 178:17 179:16,18 179:22 180:2,7,24 181:4,14 215:20	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13 aside 160:8 asked 6:19 106:1	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5 average 48:22 76:4 86:11 213:4	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basins 70:10,11 200:15 basis 7:11 29:3 30:9	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11 152:22 154:21 198:23 214:9
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 178:17 179:16,18 179:22 180:2,7,24 181:4,14 215:20 217:11	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13 aside 160:8 asked 6:19 106:1	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5 average 48:22 76:4 86:11 213:4 averages 92:15	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15 7:10 37:5,8 46:7,10	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basins 70:10,11 200:15 basis 7:11 29:3 30:9 58:1 86:14 91:17	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11 152:22 154:21 198:23 214:9 benefit 100:5 102:9
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 178:17 179:16,18 179:22 180:2,7,24 181:4,14 215:20 217:11 arc 65:1	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13 aside 160:8 asked 6:19 106:1 167:11 asking 109:12 113:1	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5 average 48:22 76:4 86:11 213:4 averages 92:15 avoid 23:24 134:7	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15 7:10 37:5,8 46:7,10 46:12 52:15 69:16	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basins 70:10,11 200:15 basis 7:11 29:3 30:9 58:1 86:14 91:17 92:14 112:1 134:23	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11 152:22 154:21 198:23 214:9 benefit 100:5 102:9 138:21 149:10
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 179:22 180:2,7,24 181:4,14 215:20 217:11 arc 65:1 architecture 176:11	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13 aside 160:8 asked 6:19 106:1 167:11 asking 109:12 113:1 224:9	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5 average 48:22 76:4 86:11 213:4 averages 92:15 avoid 23:24 134:7 137:1,15 158:1	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15 7:10 37:5,8 46:7,10 46:12 52:15 69:16 112:8,14,17 113:5	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basins 70:10,11 200:15 basis 7:11 29:3 30:9 58:1 86:14 91:17 92:14 112:1 134:23 135:8 165:11	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11 152:22 154:21 198:23 214:9 benefit 100:5 102:9 138:21 149:10 benefits 70:23 78:12
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 178:17 179:16,18 179:22 180:2,7,24 181:4,14 215:20 217:11 arc 65:1 architecture 176:11 area 16:25 18:20	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13 aside 160:8 asked 6:19 106:1 167:11 asking 109:12 113:1 224:9 aspect 159:3	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5 average 48:22 76:4 86:11 213:4 averages 92:15 avoid 23:24 134:7 137:1,15 158:1 204:23 214:17	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15 7:10 37:5,8 46:7,10 46:12 52:15 69:16 112:8,14,17 113:5 113:12 115:23	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basins 70:10,11 200:15 basis 7:11 29:3 30:9 58:1 86:14 91:17 92:14 112:1 134:23 135:8 165:11 166:17 209:22	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11 152:22 154:21 198:23 214:9 benefit 100:5 102:9 138:21 149:10 benefits 70:23 78:12 83:5 86:17 93:12
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 178:17 179:16,18 179:22 180:2,7,24 181:4,14 215:20 217:11 arc 65:1 architecture 176:11 area 16:25 18:20 25:18 28:19 32:13	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13 aside 160:8 asked 6:19 106:1 167:11 asking 109:12 113:1 224:9 aspect 159:3 aspects 4:24 63:17	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5 average 48:22 76:4 86:11 213:4 averages 92:15 avoid 23:24 134:7 137:1,15 158:1 204:23 214:17 avoiding 117:2	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15 7:10 37:5,8 46:7,10 46:12 52:15 69:16 112:8,14,17 113:5 113:12 115:23 118:19 119:6	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basis 70:10,11 200:15 basis 7:11 29:3 30:9 58:1 86:14 91:17 92:14 112:1 134:23 135:8 165:11 166:17 209:22 214:21	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11 152:22 154:21 198:23 214:9 benefit 100:5 102:9 138:21 149:10 benefits 70:23 78:12 83:5 86:17 93:12 99:2,9 102:8,19
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 178:17 179:16,18 179:22 180:2,7,24 181:4,14 215:20 217:11 arc 65:1 architecture 176:11 area 16:25 18:20	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13 aside 160:8 asked 6:19 106:1 167:11 asking 109:12 113:1 224:9 aspect 159:3	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5 average 48:22 76:4 86:11 213:4 averages 92:15 avoid 23:24 134:7 137:1,15 158:1 204:23 214:17	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15 7:10 37:5,8 46:7,10 46:12 52:15 69:16 112:8,14,17 113:5 113:12 115:23 118:19 119:6 120:13,17,18 121:1	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basins 70:10,11 200:15 basis 7:11 29:3 30:9 58:1 86:14 91:17 92:14 112:1 134:23 135:8 165:11 166:17 209:22	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11 152:22 154:21 198:23 214:9 benefit 100:5 102:9 138:21 149:10 benefits 70:23 78:12 83:5 86:17 93:12
approaching 4:10 35:3 appropriately 20:15 57:24 Arabian 19:4 arbitral 147:7 arbitration 1:1,4 2:18 2:21 6:21 7:7 116:21 117:9 118:18 121:12,13 125:3 126:1 130:18 133:9 134:13,17 136:2,10,25 137:23 138:9 139:2,2,20 140:2,3,6,11,24 141:18 142:2 151:7 151:10 156:17 157:22 159:22 160:12 161:10 163:3 167:19 168:8 168:13 169:20,23 172:2,12,22 173:14 174:8,12 176:13,18 178:17 179:16,18 179:22 180:2,7,24 181:4,14 215:20 217:11 arc 65:1 architecture 176:11 area 16:25 18:20 25:18 28:19 32:13	art 195:12 218:14 article 1:1 2:21,25 8:19 9:8,9 43:10 119:13 120:9 127:9 135:20,20,20 140:14,20 142:5 143:1 146:6 149:7 168:1 173:5 180:23 183:13,14,22 185:2 185:7 186:1 188:5 189:5,7,21 193:7,15 194:13,22,23 195:6 195:18 196:2,8,9 197:2,9 202:22,25 203:1,9 204:7,9,15 204:21 205:2,4,6,7 205:15 208:22,24 209:18 211:9 217:4 217:5,6 218:19,21 Articles 193:23 194:1 articulation 10:14 artificial 42:16 145:11 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 148:6,8,13 aside 160:8 asked 6:19 106:1 167:11 asking 109:12 113:1 224:9 aspect 159:3 aspects 4:24 63:17	Austria 216:9 authoritative 126:4 177:1 automatically 84:14 availability 46:25 72:23 75:24 83:9 97:16 available 20:9 25:6 51:17 68:21 71:7 72:6,15 74:3,9 75:21 76:6,8,24,25 77:15,16 78:16,22 79:3 81:10 82:16,18 83:1,21 85:8,24 87:7,25,25 88:2,16 89:7,8,8,23 91:8,16 91:23 93:12 95:24 96:4,6,7 98:4,7 99:10,15,20 100:13 100:17,20 101:10 101:13,16 103:18 104:3,6,23,24 110:4 129:22 217:9 219:9 avails 10:5 average 48:22 76:4 86:11 213:4 averages 92:15 avoid 23:24 134:7 137:1,15 158:1 204:23 214:17 avoiding 117:2	B b 28:2 122:12 183:20 back 8:9,13,22 9:15 10:19 11:8 16:18 38:7 53:11 56:11 60:22 70:2 106:4 111:6 113:15 115:1 115:6 138:23 143:11 147:2,18,19 150:15 152:19 156:12 170:24 178:13 192:13 193:18 200:13 206:24 207:1 208:2 210:3 218:17 220:5 220:15,20 backdrop 116:19 119:7 159:19 background 62:24 64:7 66:13 91:24 Baglihar 3:13 2:17 4:25 5:21 6:1,14,15 7:10 37:5,8 46:7,10 46:12 52:15 69:16 112:8,14,17 113:5 113:12 115:23 118:19 119:6 120:13,17,18 121:1 121:11 122:21	barrage 19:2,3 barrages 52:19 barring 114:12 base 110:16 based 13:12 39:6 58:21 94:6 111:14 112:19 147:6 166:5 baseload 86:9 87:9 99:20 100:11 102:19 basic 12:17 13:15 112:21 142:7 149:3 196:4 basically 13:14,22 22:8 24:22 25:15 28:24 32:20 38:20 39:8 42:21 43:7,19 43:24 44:3,18,20 49:20,24 53:18 54:6 55:14 62:2 132:5 195:13 basin 71:11 185:2 197:11 basis 70:10,11 200:15 basis 7:11 29:3 30:9 58:1 86:14 91:17 92:14 112:1 134:23 135:8 165:11 166:17 209:22 214:21	beginning 50:20 57:3 64:18 65:3 117:5 210:1 behaviour 111:8 behind 113:24 145:2 188:5 201:3 being 13:4,9 17:17 20:21 21:24 42:24 46:11 53:17 68:13 75:9 79:9 94:14 99:12 107:6 112:15 136:18 137:1 150:19 165:11 177:1 181:11 186:17 187:18 199:13 200:18 218:10,16 Belgique 147:19 believe 7:6,7 8:18 54:9 75:14 115:16 believed 165:6 below 29:17 33:10 45:21 67:24 82:11 86:9 129:3 152:11 152:22 154:21 198:23 214:9 benefit 100:5 102:9 138:21 149:10 benefits 70:23 78:12 83:5 86:17 93:12 99:2,9 102:8,19

Page 2
Trevor McGowan
Amended

	ı		ı	ı	ı
bespoke 184:21	178:19,24,25	195:14	calculated 112:22	148:24 149:1,5	146:10 149:25
best 3:2 93:24 100:23	179:18,23 180:3	bridges 53:14	calculating 112:13	151:15,17 153:14	150:17 158:4
136:12 175:3 204:4	181:6,13,17	brief 2:6 71:19 101:5	129:20	160:5 164:11	163:20 165:15
212:22 213:22	bioenergy 92:4	188:8	calculation 102:14	177:12 203:22	167:18 169:10
214:2,11,12,17	biomass 89:22	briefer 163:18 172:7	106:11 107:10	211:6 223:17	170:3,23 171:6,8
215:24 216:4,15,15	bit 2:9 11:12 13:11	briefest 1:16	calculations 105:19	cases 29:12 36:11 76:5	179:9 180:11,25
216:17,23 218:24	21:20 26:11 35:10	briefly 116:15 183:16	California 96:20,25	113:2,3 152:12	181:2,9,21,25
221:18	53:11 57:11 64:7	191:24 213:25	97:6,20	cast 159:9 202:21	182:15,22 191:10
Bethlehem 2:9 3:2	78:8 83:24 91:20,24	219:20	call 36:2 45:22 52:2	casting 158:1	191:11,21 192:15
better 38:12 51:13	112:9,25 113:24	bring 78:25 93:7	58:9 84:6 89:4	cat 50:14	192:20 193:21
68:17 150:1 201:20	114:4,18 132:1	110:15,16 149:8	called 7:24 16:15 28:9	catastrophic 18:9 21:3	206:2 219:13 220:3
between 1:15 28:24	169:15 170:8,10,18	195:25 196:1	78:15 92:7 99:6	categories 121:20,24	220:7,23 221:18
32:13 43:25 57:14	221:5	211:13 220:5	came 31:1 56:10,11	122:9 138:11	223:17,23 224:5,14
67:15,18 74:7,12	bits 94:21	bringing 212:22	187:8 216:5	208:17	challenge 17:3,11,13
76:16 80:11 83:18	black 32:22 67:25	brings 4:18 89:15	CAMERON 2:10	caught 9:19 224:2,11	180:5,6 181:4,16
87:10,12 97:7 98:14	78:24	193:6,8	Canada 94:23 185:2	cause 40:6,6 209:3,7	challenged 146:4
98:16 116:20,23	Blackmore 1:11 15:10	broad 142:4 195:15	canals 30:18 41:23,24	215:10	179:15 180:11
117:2 118:2 122:24	15:12 16:10,12,15	broader 106:8 130:9	48:7 53:19	caused 21:3 188:18	181:7,12 182:2
123:3 124:18 127:5	19:17 20:16,22	163:25 164:15	canon 167:16 193:22	189:1	challenges 17:12
127:7 133:16	blank 208:18	166:1,4 168:18,24	193:25 194:11	causes 82:12 188:11	change 5:11 15:3
136:24 143:5	BLINK 2:21	182:5	capabilities 70:21	cautious 127:13 128:9	19:23 48:10,12,15
144:13 145:16	blip 17:6	broadest 11:2	72:22 74:21	CEA 69:10	48:19 49:1,8,21,25 50:5,6 54:9,13,17
148:20 162:1 171:25 173:22	blocking 21:4,22 blocks 48:2	broadly 135:25 165:10 166:6,17	capability 70:8 75:22 99:22 100:3,4,11	cement 76:16,19 cemented 3:11	66:11 85:6 95:10,11
171:25 173:22 176:11 183:14	blocks 48:2 block-loading 83:7	brought 52:5 153:13	99:22 100:3,4,11 212:13	cemented 3:11 cent 22:19 23:5	100:8 102:11 108:7
191:14 193:7,9	blow 11:5	brushes 11:2	capable 140:23	central 5:22,23 6:4,4	108:10,13 109:18
197:14 193.7,9	blue 68:9,14 79:5,10	BRYCE 2:20	capacities 12:24	central 3.22,23 0.4,4 centred 154:1	109:22 111:9
beyond 6:15 7:4 124:3	97:4,18 122:8,11	bucket 18:3,7	capacity 12:16 17:16	cents 23:5 92:22,24	112:21 163:11
125:25 135:17	139:10	buffer 85:7,16 95:13	20:12 22:11 26:5	93:1,24 94:6	164:10,23 165:1,10
136:20 144:10,19	board 44:6	101:14	29:20 30:7 42:3	century 13:2 64:16,19	165:23 166:5,8,13
148:4 153:19 155:6	bodies 119:13,15	buffering 96:17 102:3	52:18,20 57:13	65:3,6 70:3	166:16 188:11,16
162:6 163:24	135:9	buffers 107:9	67:15,18,20,21,23	certain 9:4 31:9 34:16	188:22,25 200:21
164:25 166:13	body 126:16 146:7	build 33:24 57:9 59:2	68:1,11,12,15,23	34:17 43:1,1 49:4,5	213:2,4,20,20
177:19 204:12	148:22	178:1	69:1,17,18 70:15	49:16 55:14 57:13	changed 16:22 65:16
big 17:12 18:17 30:9	bordering 215:11	building 1:18 2:7 11:2	72:24 73:10 76:9	61:2,24 85:19 95:9	66:3 73:14 164:4
31:21 32:13 35:19	born 65:5	60:24 155:22	81:11 88:4 92:11	110:4,15 111:4	167:1 187:19
35:20 42:22 46:16	Bosnian 149:4	Buildings 2:10,11	97:21 190:15	117:23 120:20	201:16
48:15 54:14 57:5	both 3:17 36:11 49:9	builds 210:16	201:15 205:20	155:22 158:6	changes 28:11 78:17
58:4 86:20 93:25	50:1,15,16,17 51:10	built 17:17 37:25	206:3,19,21,22	163:24 169:3	81:2 84:2 85:6
213:15	65:17 66:19,22	105:21 114:1	220:10	179:13 185:3 188:1	96:17 99:5 101:3
bigger 16:18 31:11	68:15 90:6,25 91:1	205:18	capita 66:20	197:20 207:16,18	106:13 107:2
biggest 53:9 95:2	96:16 104:12,13	bulk 18:21	capital 73:11 193:1	certainly 3:14 58:14	109:18 162:24
billion 58:4	117:8 119:14	bulldozer 56:12	capture 93:11 103:10	59:5 103:19 113:10	165:8,18
bills 72:19 75:18	120:25 121:13	bundles 91:11	captured 12:5	113:15 132:16	changing 54:17
Bin 146:22 147:18 bind 155:15	123:9 124:24	buried 37:22	career 50:21	133:21 145:17	106:15,18 108:15
bind 155:15 binding 7:13 120:10	126:24 127:10,25 128:23 131:6	BURKI 2:5 business 224:3	careful 166:21 carefully 134:6 169:6	147:25 164:2 165:1 165:14,15 166:3,15	203:14 214:1 channel 31:8,12,23,24
121:12,15 123:8	134:22 136:18	business 224:3 buy 17:20	Caribbean 27:20	167:15 177:6 182:6	34:16,18 43:4,11,13
125:1.15.25 126:5	137:7 151:12 156:6	Buying 23:11	carried 204:25	192:13 194:6	43:15
126:13,17 128:22	160:3,15 178:9	Buytaert 1:12 51:21	cars 109:20,23 110:2	215:25	chapeau 197:9 202:7
129:12 130:16,18	190:11 207:12	51:24 54:7 56:21	carve-out 10:9 187:13	certainty 126:23	character 108:21
132:7 135:8 136:23	bottom 27:1 28:2,14	57:10 59:5 105:10	cascade 22:5 42:4,5,6	211:13	140:5
138:2,8 139:2,3,10	28:19,20 29:18 38:6	105:13 106:5,7	42:25 43:1 60:25	cetera 14:1 18:22	characterise 217:14
139:11 140:1,5,13	43:3,5 44:14 66:16	107:21 220:3,4,17	61:2,14	26:17 31:15 41:3	characterised 8:17
140:25 141:9,24	79:8,10 83:16 86:3	220:22	cascades 60:21	45:9 48:7 62:1,5	201:21
142:1,16,18,21	86:9 88:7 97:4,18	Buytaert's 59:10	case 1:3 2:21 5:22 6:4	135:17	characterising 9:6
144:4,4,9,23 145:16	203:1	bypass 25:9 26:10,11	9:17,18,20,23 23:19	Chairman 1:3,8,14,21	characteristic 61:23
145:21 146:4 151:9	bought 19:20	27:5,13 195:15	24:4 33:9 40:20	3:6 7:16 8:20 10:20	87:3 104:15 161:3
151:11 155:2,5	boulders 26:4 56:4,11	by-pass 188:19	53:5 56:4 57:24	11:9,19 12:9 15:10	characteristics 63:13
156:4,6,16,21	bound 222:10	B(1) 152:17 158:17	59:18 61:4 76:3	23:15 32:4 33:18	78:1 82:1 90:25
157:24 158:11	breach 140:18 149:11	B(2) 158:17	85:22 98:6,15 99:1	35:11 51:21 59:8	charged 109:21
160:10 161:11	break 62:11,16 114:5	B(3) 152:18	107:11 111:21	60:20 62:6,13,14,18	chart 70:14 78:8,10
162:19 163:3 168:8	114:11,13,14 115:3	B(4) 157:20 158:16,22	118:18,19 119:6	62:22 105:7 107:22	cheaper 22:23
168:12,15 172:11	115:8 169:12,13		120:12 122:15	112:6 113:9,18	cheapest 22:22 23:6
172:18 173:25	170:2,10,24 171:4	<u>C</u>	123:13 127:18	114:7,24 115:6,10	check 105:8 133:22
174:16 176:6,12,14	171:10,18 224:7	C 197:11 205:8	130:16 133:5	115:14,19 131:21	134:3 Changh 37:5 5 38:13
176:17,19,23 177:2 177:3,13,16,18	bricks 3:9,13 bridge 188:18 189:3	calculate 75:6 101:18	135:13 142:10 147:19 148:17,20	131:22 133:6 143:10 145:6	Chenab 37:5,5 38:13 42:17 53:6 54:4
177.3,13,10,10	bridge 100.10 107.3	101:22	147.17 140.17,20	143.10 143.0	44.17 33.0 34.4
I	I		l		Ī

190:22 202:8	close 1:21 30:10,15,16	86:25 95:21 97:25	149:23 159:17,18	172:19 173:1,1	consent 137:8
Cheng 146:22 147:18	36:16 46:21 48:8	100:25 101:9	159:22,24 160:4,6	concerning 117:18,24	consequence 182:6
Chile 25:22	51:16,19 56:14	169:24 218:2	168:16 172:13,18	120:25 121:3	consequences 18:9
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		,		-
China 30:20 39:2,9	83:20 151:14	comfortable 170:7	172:24 173:5,15,21	140:16 141:17	35:7 43:18 122:17
43:9 216:9	169:11 170:1	coming 1:22 4:17 38:3	174:1,3,4,10,14,16	182:4 214:23	157:17
choose 155:23	closed 173:6	41:10 50:4 56:4	178:25 179:4,14,17	217:21	consequently 150:22
circle 196:13	closely 113:5 223:1	90:5,12 92:19	179:25 180:2,4,12	concerns 7:9 63:25	conservation 14:17
circumstance 179:12	closer 23:10 79:8	100:19 102:15	180:15,21 181:5,11	119:11 120:20	consider 33:12,13
circumstances 32:4	90:19	103:6 104:23 105:1	181:23	156:19 214:25	41:25 128:5 209:9
33:22 117:8 118:17	closing 8:10	106:20 114:11	competencies 136:24	concession 187:10	considerable 14:14
121:23 122:15	clouds 98:1	144:16 189:6	competent 124:9,11	191:6	consideration 71:12
136:8 137:12 152:2	coal 67:4 68:2 91:9	191:24 196:17	124:16 150:19	conclude 50:9 105:6	138:7 155:14 175:5
162:25 163:8,24	93:21,21	200:13 212:19	173:11	178:12 179:6	215:9
164:7,23 165:8,23	coal-fired 87:21	219:3	competing 193:25	concluded 175:10	considerations 5:12
166:13 167:2	103:21,22	comity 137:18	211:14 214:19	178:3 212:16	57:16
circumvent 142:24	coated 37:20 48:4	commenced 127:8	compiling 170:17	214:20	considered 44:20 76:5
216:23 218:12	coatings 13:21 14:1	commences 211:16	complement 95:4	concludes 219:11	101:3 130:5 131:2
citation 169:5	51:13 213:9	commensurate 173:9	complementary 70:1	concluding 139:24	176:3 193:22
cite 139:8	cobbles 35:20 46:2	comment 15:2 63:5	91:1	conclusion 21:10,17	considering 65:4
cited 118:24 119:3,5	code 139:9	214:15	complete 114:20	136:8 137:21,23	72:22
136:14 147:12	coffee 62:11 114:13,14	comments 11:10 48:9	196:13	139:22 150:9	considers 153:18
216:8	115:3,8 169:12	71:19	completely 6:2 26:4	177:25 178:7	164:19 201:17
	T				
cites 146:24 147:18	170:10,24 224:7	commercial 65:2	35:7 55:1,1,8 56:19	203:16	consistency 90:24
citing 217:10	cofferdam 26:24,25	147:19	60:15 100:13	conclusions 5:18 6:3	127:10 202:3,7,16
civilisation 19:18	cognisant 51:3	Commission 127:5,17	132:21	103:3	consistent 125:9
claim 180:14	coincide 15:24 193:4	127:20 201:6	completion 11:17	conclusive 127:23	127:22 128:21
claims 211:14	cold 11:4	209:18,20 210:15	complex 72:21	concrete 51:6 55:17	134:10 174:13
clarification 153:12	collapsing 40:6	223:15	compliance 124:18	76:16,18 175:23	190:18 200:18
154:12,19 155:8	colleague 171:14	Commissioner 2:4 7:3	185:16 195:19	condition 60:11,12	204:14 212:4 219:1
158:20	colleagues 4:20 105:8	119:2,4 122:25	210:7,17 211:17	76:4 202:7	consistently 123:6,25
clarification/interpr	105:25	123:1 127:23 128:4	compliant 29:18,19	conditioning 196:14	125:11
155:1 156:2	collected 31:1	128:8,13,21 129:18	210:23	conditions 41:17	consists 183:1
clarify 220:15	collects 45:25	131:12 208:9	complicated 89:13	52:17 54:12,18	constant 80:20,21
clarity 131:6	Colombia 25:17,18	209:24 210:16	107:11	92:16 188:1 192:10	81:1,22 108:3
classification 89:21	45:2,5 145:4 148:18	211:5,6	complied 199:14	195:25 199:19	189:19 210:6
clause 147:25 148:1	Colombian 45:9	Commissioners	comply 199:21 207:6	202:8,16 212:14	constituencies 172:21
148:15,19 196:10	colour 66:1 68:9,14	118:25 173:23	219:19	214:1	constituent 178:20
204:1	96:24 97:19 139:9	common 78:7 92:14	complying 33:23	conduct 214:6	constitute 140:18
cleaning 171:10	colouring 122:8	93:20 166:24 218:9	196:15	conducted 214:13	152:16
clear 13:10 24:17	colour-coding 178:16	commonplace 166:24	component 68:24	cone 21:14 36:14	constituted 146:3
30:21 31:2 33:14,15	Columbia 185:1,4	communicate 209:25	components 212:8	confess 23:16	155:13
49:11 50:3 51:25	column 92:3 208:18	communicated 157:6	comprehensive	configured 91:22 93:9	constitutes 143:13
67:24 92:3,17	220:9,13	communities 61:13,14	214:16	confined 6:8,12	constituting 176:23
114:21 120:5	columns 78:8,10,21	61:17,19 62:3	comprised 134:18	173:16	constitution 117:8
124:25 125:15	combination 73:9	comparative 39:18	comprises 68:15	confirm 121:9,15	145:25
131:3,4,24 132:1,20	76:1 104:9,20 142:4	comparator 184:18	computation 75:4	134:8 146:25 190:5	constrain 97:9 196:18
133:19,25 140:10	combine 193:10	compare 37:1 45:16	101:19	210:23	constrained 9:4 10:3
141:11 150:7	combined 77:21	58:1 92:13	compute 101:15	confirmed 74:5 136:3	71:8 103:14 183:8
			•		
154:22 155:25	combined-cycle 93:19	compared 16:7 19:15	computed 75:19 76:2	140:7 141:23 142:8	207:24
159:1 171:21	come 8:9,20,22 9:18	35:17 103:16	81:11 112:9	146:21 149:21	constraining 191:9
172:14,16 176:10	10:19 38:6,7 57:8	159:23	computing 92:10	151:14 217:24	197:18
177:5 181:16	59:19 68:6 70:23	comparison 37:4	compétence 174:7,7	confirms 173:21	constrains 207:19
188:13,24 191:16	85:20 89:1 94:22,24	93:15	conceded 130:4	conflicting 137:16	constraint 3:24 61:16
195:16 200:9	96:13 106:4 107:10	compartmented 25:10	conceived 200:24	conform 196:24	constraints 3:21 33:19
201:17 220:8	111:3,6 113:15	25:11	concentrated 43:17	confuses 206:14	34:2 72:1 97:9
cleared 56:12	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	compatible 196:3	concentrating 92:7	confusing 169:16	103:14,15 155:19
	115:1,6 150:15			C	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
clearest 154:24	154:7 162:5 168:25	213:10	concentration 38:16	confusion 169:24	175:9,14 197:6
clearly 9:18 35:10	170:24 184:8	compelled 194:14	41:7,18	conjunction 32:9	200:11 212:23
102:20 106:9	187:23 192:2,13	compendium 170:16	concentrations 30:6	connected 22:8	construct 205:16,21
133:18 152:7 169:6	193:18 201:25	compete 103:12	41:11,14 53:16	connection 37:14	207:20 209:2 222:2
171:20 186:15	206:24 207:1	competence 116:18	concept 52:1 163:23	120:16 125:13,22	constructed 8:17
climate 5:11 14:13	211:21 213:19	121:18,21,25 122:1	166:20 172:3	133:2,4 136:1,15	120:14 205:24
48:9,12,14,19 49:8	218:17 220:15,20	122:2,3,7,11 126:16	184:22	144:16 165:10	206:4 212:9
49:10,21,25 54:9,13	221:12	134:15 136:6	concepts 198:11	166:20 172:25	construction 15:1
54:17 163:11	comes 10:6 22:8 29:16	137:13 139:12	199:22,23	178:23 179:3,25	69:12 123:18,21
164:10,25 165:10	41:10 49:25 50:7	140:22 141:2,6,8,20	conceptual 35:4 57:11	181:18 182:3	136:13 155:20
166:5,16 213:2,4	52:25 54:19 58:25	141:23 142:4	concern 21:7 52:4	connectivity 90:23	157:5 208:21 210:2
climate-sensitive 49:2	71:11 76:19 80:16	145:23 146:8,9	concerned 135:11,25	98:9	210:5 211:3,7,15
Cambridge School to 47.2	71.11 70.17 00.10	113.23 170.0,7	20110011100 133.11,23	70.7	210.5 211.5,7,15

Page 4

Trevor McGowan

Amended

	1	1			
215:23 216:18	212:14 215:1 218:5	198:10 204:16	192:12 196:15,22	85:18,22 86:14	dav-bv-dav 91:16
221:22	controlled 20:2 81:20	coupled 80:25	197:20 199:22,24	96:18 102:7,18	de 147:19 174:7
construe 194:23,24	controlling 2:25	course 1:6 4:16 5:22	200:4,13,16,20	104:15 188:11,17	204:13
construed 10:3 194:3	136:23 138:8 140:1	6:22,24 7:18,21	207:9 218:2	188:23 199:10	dead 28:10 29:17
construing 10:23	176:12	8:23 11:14 14:25	criterion 223:6	210:8,9	33:11 129:3 152:11
194:23,25	Convention 135:16	18:25 38:1 40:3,13	critical 76:2 120:3,6	dam 15:2 17:23,23,23	152:22 154:21
consultation 208:6	193:24 194:6	41:14 42:25 46:13	120:23 122:1	18:8 26:2,2,4,21	198:16,23 199:4
209:15 223:16	conventional 223:9	53:24 56:18 57:23	critically 75:3 142:23	28:3,4 33:24 34:5,9	deal 9:6 12:22 15:3,5
consume 104:9	conventions 184:17	61:11 67:2 76:18	cross-reference 192:6	34:23,24,25 35:2,5	15:6 16:24 18:10
consumed 64:13	conversion 80:4	83:8 86:3 94:2 95:3	192:25	36:3,8,9,12 39:24	19:10 32:5 48:15
consumption 66:20	convert 80:16	99:14 112:20	cross-referenced	39:24 40:1 41:17	50:2 76:21 78:19
_					
75:18 203:17	converted 31:20 34:11	116:17 118:14,16	150:4 193:2	42:15,17,18 45:20	85:14 88:20 101:21
contained 151:9	converting 25:23	122:3 123:14 125:7	Crucially 173:4	45:21 46:15 53:15	104:19 106:12
contend 98:6	converts 46:7	126:11 131:22,24	crux 143:2	55:1,17 56:4,6,17	205:7
contended 216:6	cooperate 208:25	132:13 133:16	crystal-clear 38:22	56:22 58:7,22 61:9	dealing 16:19 76:13
content 148:8 170:10	210:13	140:22 146:11,22	176:10	201:3,8,14 214:9	97:21,24 107:2
context 49:6 52:4,5	cooperating 208:20	147:11 148:17	cubic 46:4,9 201:9	215:1	109:7 193:3,11
60:21,23 116:14,15	cooperation 183:17	152:13 157:17	cure-all 15:1	damage 204:24	199:20
118:15 159:3,20,22	189:19 208:1,6	158:16 159:20	curious 150:3	damaged 55:8 56:18	deals 96:16 189:21
161:4 164:3,22	209:17 210:4,14,24	160:15,23 164:17	current 205:13 216:1	dams 15:5 16:15,20,21	dealt 6:10 112:23
		-			
165:2,3,25 173:3	211:1 219:10	165:3 166:12	currently 59:15	16:25 17:5 19:14	168:14,16 193:5
175:20 182:7 188:2	cooperative 184:25	168:25 169:3,17	currents 25:13	23:21,25 52:14	debate 10:7 144:17
192:1 194:15	208:4	173:10 174:20	curriculum 51:7	54:15 60:21,25 61:4	debris 26:3 56:3
202:20 205:13	coordination 116:20	180:9 185:23	cursor 29:1	61:12,15	decade 67:8
215:18	117:2	191:22 223:20	curve 83:23 85:22	dam/short 58:22	decades 45:11 51:12
Continental 148:3	core 66:2	courts 2:20 6:20	86:1,6,8,9 87:3	danger 21:23 55:16	60:18
contingency 114:1	corner 43:6	134:17 136:25	104:21 108:22	Daniel 2:9 3:2 1:5,7,8	December 188:7
contingent 195:19	corollary 185:8	139:1 141:18 142:2	109:3,22 110:11	1:14,24 2:1 11:9,19	decide 124:9 141:6
continue 1:15 2:5 3:23	Corps 43:22 44:2	150:19 157:22	112:1	62:13 106:3 112:6	149:8,15 179:21,22
25:7 61:2 65:9	correct 18:21 38:10	160:12 167:18	curves 87:1 88:23	113:24 114:7 115:2	decided 35:1 118:9
119:19	62:13 108:16,25	172:11 178:21	89:1 104:14,16,19	115:9 155:17 170:2	148:25 182:9
continued 3:4 12:13	110:12 133:17	180:2,6 194:7	108:18,19 109:6,13	170:3 171:2 193:19	decides 179:13,20
64:17 117:11	146:18,18 213:21	Court's 2:19 3:1	109:16,17 110:13	194:12 224:1,5,15	deciding 123:11
137:10 148:11	218:18 220:1	116:14,18 121:8,9	111:10,13,14,19	darker 68:14 97:18	149:18 160:16
175:24	correction 83:3	121:14,20,24	cusecs 165:5	Dasu 17:17,19 22:6	decision 47:6 57:16
continues 93:4 120:8	correctly 8:18 27:4	123:11 124:25	customary 160:19	data 37:19,20 49:19	120:2 121:9,14
120:18 125:17	correspondence 127:7	132:4 133:13	167:24 169:1,3	60:8 107:2 208:23	122:9,10,11 127:14
continuous 45:14 88:7	130:11	136:21 141:8 142:1	194:8 221:23 222:6	209:7 210:9,20	127:24 128:10,23
88:10	corresponding 9:2,11	142:4,22 149:7	222:11,15 223:4,8	214:23	129:11,13 130:10
continuously 45:15	199:14	151:12 153:9,11	223:13	database 184:17	130:17,22 132:4,14
82:9 219:8	cost 22:22 23:4,12	154:3,10 155:2	customer 99:8	data-sharing 223:16	133:10 135:10
contract 47:1	24:18 35:24 46:23	156:4,5,8,20,22	customers 75:25 80:9	date 65:2 66:10 104:1	138:9,10,12 143:15
contractor 37:25	46:23 47:4 58:3	157:9 158:17 159:1	cut 16:12,15,21 44:14	116:18 123:22	144:20 145:2,4,21
contradict 120:9	62:5 73:3,9 92:10	160:3 161:8,15	170:15	156:25 157:3,5	146:8 147:4 148:9
contradict 120.5 contrary 159:19 180:6	92:11,20,24 93:2,18	215:5	cutter-head 45:18	174:19	
contrary 159:19 180:6 contrast 15:12 29:10	93:24 94:8,13 103:4	cover 14:7,8 170:13	46:2	dated 116:3 127:20	148:20,22 149:1
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			153:9,11,15 154:10
125:11 130:18	103:12	170:22 171:24	cutting 2:2	141:8	154:25 155:9 156:1
134:24 161:11	costing 74:3	covered 70:11 102:23	cyclones 27:21	day 1:6 3:1 1:7,13	156:2,4,5,8 157:13
176:6	costly 44:12 55:19	148:13		71:16,16 76:24 77:1	157:16 158:20,24
contrasting 125:2	57:25	covering 190:23	D	77:8,10,12,14 81:12	159:2,4,19 161:17
176:4	costs 47:5 72:15 92:2	covers 144:24	d 1:10 7:15 8:19 10:12	82:25 85:19 86:23	162:9 163:7 165:4,6
contribute 79:17 83:3	92:12 93:7,8 94:7,9	Covid 94:3	10:15 124:19	87:1,1,4,5 88:8,9,17	165:10 166:9 172:2
contributes 84:5	111:4	co-operation 208:24	135:18,24 136:11	94:16,19,24 95:1,16	172:17,23 173:25
contribution 79:3,15	cost-effectiveness	209:22	138:14 157:7 178:5	95:25,25 96:9,20,25	174:3,17,20 175:21
84:3,24 97:11	65:15	co-operative 209:21		97:7,13,13,24	176:4,6,19 177:11
contributions 79:11	Counsel 2:20,20	crack 58:4	183:11 184:12	101:16,17 110:4,15	179:15,17 180:2,6
contributions 89:21	count 100:5	crazy 22:16,17	189:23 191:6,9,19	110:17 111:4	180:14,16,21 182:4
		•	192:5,12,18,23		′ ′
control 13:23 15:8	countered 214:11	create 18:13 39:25	193:1,16,17 194:14	114:10,17,19,23	182:8,11 decisions 2:20 6:20
23:21 32:22 33:25	counterpart 7:4	42:16 52:3,9,17	194:22,24 195:19	191:22 224:2,3,17	
34:24 41:13 42:15	countries 17:8 73:14	80:21 99:7	195:22,23 196:1,12	daylight 94:17	117:3 118:20,24
42:24 60:23 81:23	90:7 104:7	created 16:10 31:9	196:18,20,23 197:8	days 7:21 23:10,10	119:9,12 121:1,3,11
82:17,22,24 83:13	country 14:16 17:11	45:5 80:4	197:13,17 198:8,17	27:22 29:23,25	121:16,19 122:14
84:1,17,17 86:18	22:12 37:17 108:23	creates 85:5	198:20 199:4	40:20 102:15	122:17 123:5 125:3
110:24 154:17	108:24 187:1	creating 202:15	200:22 205:17	196:17 198:10	125:17 126:18
162:7 164:25	counts 66:23	crest 56:6	209:23 210:21,25	200:1 204:17	132:8 134:13 137:1
166:10,13 187:6	couple 7:21 25:3	crest-gated 36:10	212:1,20 217:7	212:19 221:12	137:16 139:3,4,7,10
200:17 202:23	29:25 38:24 48:9,15	criteria 2:11 4:11 7:14	218:3,4,13,22	daytime 87:23 95:19	139:11,13,19,21
204:18,23 205:4	55:9 56:7 65:5	10:24 191:8 192:5	daily 29:3 71:15 77:5	96:4 98:5	140:1,4,6,24 141:2
.,		,	uany 27.3 [1.13 [].3		, , , ,

	T	T	T	T	T
141:7 142:1,6	delivery 75:24	210:22 211:3,15,23	210:14	133:8 146:15	144:13
147:12 151:9,12	delta 20:17 21:11,12	212:2,17 213:3,13	developments 65:2	149:17 157:20	disputes 116:25
152:1 156:16	21:13,21 28:17	213:20 216:19	203:19 214:1	168:25	124:12,14,18
157:24 160:10	35:13,18,19	218:6,9,12 221:23	develops 196:21 198:5	disadvantages 35:22	126:20,21 128:1,24
163:4 167:25	deluge 1:9	222:16 223:12	devices 91:2	43:2 51:11	140:23 142:5,19
168:15,25 172:6,10	demand 49:14,16 64:9	designed 27:5,6 56:5	devoted 161:22	disagreed 148:19	144:5 147:8 149:9
174:9,15 176:13,15	64:10,14,18,21	120:14 162:22	diagram 12:17 13:14	174:21 182:10	149:13 151:13
177:7 178:17,23	65:10,11 70:1 71:5	166:6 197:16	35:9 71:21 78:6,21	disagreement 123:3	167:11 173:22
179:25 216:2	-	211:13	-	C	
	71:7 72:2,11,12		79:5 83:15 89:10	disappeared 109:9	178:18 201:22
decision-making	73:2,10,13,19 74:15	designing 48:20	91:25 98:13 193:10	discerned 221:9	disregard 151:8
214:14	84:10 87:16 90:19	199:23 200:22	diagrams 87:21 88:7	discharge 31:14 34:17	disregards 132:21
decisive 176:10	106:14 109:19,25	213:6	93:25 94:25	85:3 112:18 189:18	disruption 99:7
declaration 151:25	109:25 110:9,19,20	designs 123:2 125:13	Diamer-Bhasha 17:18	199:9	distance 59:22
152:7,8,10	110:23 111:13	125:19 218:14	17:19 22:6	discharged 44:17	distances 53:14
decline 41:13	210:17	desire 217:13	dictionaries 198:15	198:21 214:24	distinction 118:2
declined 92:20	demands 71:1,15	despite 108:3 131:6	die 48:5	discharges 45:19,20	136:24
declining 93:3,22	73:21 74:17 203:15	destabilise 21:21	died 55:2	discretion 103:1	distributary 41:9
decrease 14:17	demarcation 32:23	destroy 14:7,7	diesel 68:4 87:19	222:16 223:11	distribution 80:8 91:2
decreased 53:16	demonstrate 84:22	destroyed 55:1,1	differ 162:5	discretionary 97:16	94:9
decree 166:25 167:1	demonstrates 127:10	detail 3:5 8:6,13 10:14	difference 28:24 29:14	discuss 63:12,17 170:5	diversion 151:19,24
decrees 167:10	density 18:21 80:12	78:10 105:1 107:20	67:15,18 76:16	170:12	201:16
dedicated 68:21 69:1	deny 186:24	125:4,22 132:11	80:11 87:9,12	discussed 26:10 38:7	diversity 70:21
79:19 91:21 96:15	denying 134:2	134:9 138:4,22	118:12 171:24	102:14 105:1	divert 19:7 25:16
100:14,22 102:21	departs 198:14	186:8 190:7 198:8	173:24 176:10	153:18 222:8	diverts 26:25 27:1
103:25 104:9 105:4	depend 79:25 221:25	198:10,12 208:16	180:20 193:12	discussing 69:15	divided 46:5 197:13
deemed 188:19	depending 19:24	210:4	208:16	168:4 170:11	division 161:1
deep 29:15 33:21	40:25 81:25 93:8	detailed 2:9 207:8	differences 116:25	discussion 7:5 11:21	doctrine 143:2 147:17
36:11 178:2	104:13 108:21	208:6	122:20,22 140:20	12:3 23:16 46:21	149:22 164:19
deeper 34:14,14,14	depends 27:19 39:23	details 80:2 89:14	142:20 173:6	128:18 158:9	165:22
36:21	40:1 47:16,20 96:8	105:17 111:23	different 25:4,5 32:21	discussions 19:2 48:25	doctrines 126:22
defaulting 214:2	101:6 109:10	112:3,23	35:8 37:11 49:8	118:25 122:24	151:6
defer 95:24 105:24	depletion 152:22	determination 5:21	50:20,22,22 52:10	188:22 204:16	document 87:12
113:4	deploy 40:23,24	6:1,15 117:23 119:5	53:14 60:15 67:20	dismiss 132:17	187:21 190:10
deferral 96:2,6 99:15	deposit 42:8 53:12	120:13 124:1,4,5	76:15,20 79:3 81:9	dismissed 129:7	documents 112:25
deficiencies 38:11	deposited 13:17 33:2	125:18,24 126:3	81:25 85:13 87:5	dismissed 125.7 dismisses 125:11,14	186:9
deficit 85:8	33:4 53:18	129:23 130:2,25	89:2 92:16 102:23	132:4	doing 6:12,18 22:21
	deposition 18:22 33:1	132:21 135:21	106:20 108:23		
define 36:3,7 73:1	-			dispatch 46:25 64:4	24:16 61:9 77:9
74:5,20 212:13	35:14,18	136:15 137:19	111:9 112:14	71:15 77:16 86:12	86:23 88:21 102:17
defined 36:19,19	deprived 156:10	174:21 175:22	137:23 138:12	101:20	110:2 179:11
79:20 198:16 199:7	Depriving 149:10	176:1,17 178:8	155:4 172:4 178:19	dispatchable 98:23	domestic 202:25 203:2
199:23 200:10	depth 89:7	181:17 214:21	184:23 185:4 192:4	dispatched 68:22,25	203:5
203:1 204:8 210:2	Deputy 2:19	determinations	192:20 199:1	displace 178:7	DON 1:11
defines 188:6 198:3	desander 35:23 37:9	131:11 134:3	200:23 202:9	dispositif 121:25	done 21:8 27:7 34:10
defining 161:3 197:15	212:10,11	161:12 168:9	205:19	122:4,7 143:16,17	50:25 58:20 73:15
214:17	desanders 38:5,18	determination/judg	differentiate 85:12	143:20 144:10,12	91:8 105:19 111:17
definitely 16:9	describe 33:16 198:8	133:14	differentiation 43:24	144:20 145:2,14	113:22 190:7 224:2
definition 75:7 134:17	described 49:11 80:6	determinative 141:16	74:12 104:4	146:1,12,14 148:1,7	door 16:7 166:1,4
184:8 189:4 205:22	117:16 136:1	determine 63:19	differently 56:23	150:5,7,9,13,15	dots 79:5,10
definitions 102:12	description 71:22	71:14,16,24 74:14	76:21	152:4,18 156:12,20	dotted 39:21
definitive 125:1,15	design 3:3 2:11 3:18	89:4 148:14 184:16	difficult 44:11 55:21	158:14	doubling 23:3
131:8 133:24	3:21 4:11,22 7:14	determined 31:22	60:9 61:25 88:20	dispositifs 152:17	doubt 50:16 153:19
147:21 150:20	10:24 12:12,20	80:22 136:10	103:12 107:1 151:7	dispositive 6:7 132:24	158:1 159:9 224:9
160:25	17:19 26:17 27:7	146:13	163:9	dispute 117:7,13,22	down 6:6 21:15 22:14
degrade 27:9	35:3 37:25 48:11,17	determines 77:18	difficulties 68:19	118:16,22 119:12	26:24 28:2,4 29:3
degraded 14:11	48:18,21 55:23,23	88:14 92:11 101:19	114:6	119:15 126:16	29:17 30:12 32:19
degree 67:4 71:10	56:20,22 57:1 58:25	develop 71:8,10 73:2	difficulty 99:16	127:1,8 131:9 135:6	33:10 38:17 39:22
77:4 87:16 90:6	61:4,7 63:20 74:6,9	186:20	dilutes 30:5	135:9 137:14	40:1,11 47:7 49:25
100:12 117:15	80:23 103:22	developed 96:14 97:20	dilution 180:7	140:12,13,14,15	50:8 52:11 59:3
212:6	104:17 105:17	103:10 108:21,23	dimension 31:9,23,24	141:22 142:17,18	79:2 82:15 83:2,24
delay 115:15	106:10 117:17,19	186:10 203:22	dimensions 31:9	142:23,25 144:5,5,9	84:19 85:20 93:7
deliberations 5:24 6:5	120:20 131:1	developing 66:22	diminish 101:2	144:13,24 146:5	94:21 95:7 100:25
Delimitation 148:3	136:12 137:5	108:24 112:19	direct 73:16 79:20	149:17,18 153:21	109:8 110:16
delimiting 217:19	155:20 157:5	215:10	167:4 184:18	153:23,25 169:22	202:14 203:11
deliver 47:3,3 85:16	166:18 175:4,9,12	development 65:1	190:23 191:25	171:23 172:1,5	downstream 16:25
86:16 112:10	176:2 196:24 198:9	66:3,11 69:9 70:3	direction 22:1 66:4	174:18 175:4	17:22,22,24 18:9,15
delivered 27:18 81:6	199:21,24 200:9,20	73:24 93:5 96:13	82:14	176:11 180:20	18:25 19:3 22:10
85:25 141:14	201:1,10,11,17	103:5 109:4,11	directly 6:19 80:25	193:11 205:14	23:19 24:20,21 27:2
delivers 41:6	207:9 208:21 210:5	110:8 185:1 186:23	101:13 105:14,23	disputed 123:11 124:9	30:3,8,17,22 31:3,6
					, . , ,
L	1	1			

Page 6
Trevor McGowan
Amended

32:25 33:3 34:7,24	dredged 45:17	67:13 70:2 73:24	171:16	12:6 58:17,25	49:9 63:6 87:17
35:6 40:15 41:6,19	dredges 45:17 dredges 45:17	186:14 211:8	elect 19:24	134:25 160:16	90:1,19 93:3 99:2
	dredging 13:25 22:3	214:14 219:12	electric 65:13,16	173:11	126:14
41:22,23 42:8,17,21 42:23,24 43:18,20	22:15,15,17 23:2,14	earthen 39:24	109:23 110:2	engineering 3:4 4:20	essence 74:14
45:6 46:24 47:5,8	42:12 44:20,21,25	earthquake 15:23	electrical 64:25 65:10	12:13 57:3 76:17	essential 78:9 127:1
47:13,22 48:6,7	45:12,14,15 46:4,9	21:4,18	80:7,13,15,16,18,21	134:20 173:7	147:5 150:21,24
52:4,9,17,19 53:5,9	46:17,22 47:9	Earthquakes 16:3	91:2 109:20	198:15 199:2 209:2	155:15,18 157:14
53:16,17 55:2 56:7	drew 215:12	ease 139:9	electricity 63:15 64:12	212:25 213:8	essentially 21:23
59:12 62:3 80:12	drinking 203:3	easier 57:20	64:21 65:7,18 66:6	216:25	31:20 52:2 119:11
202:3,15 214:6,22	driven 112:25	easily 16:6 91:8	66:8 70:3 80:4 91:6	engineers 43:23 44:2	120:21 147:16
215:7	drop 28:14 29:4 38:16	eastern 69:22 161:7	91:9	213:3,18	Essex 2:9,10
dozens 218:10	40:4 65:23	185:25 186:23	electronics 11:20	English 50:11	establish 36:9 39:11
Dr 1:11 2:10,13 3:5	dry 29:2 38:19 88:8	189:13	elements 131:1 139:23	enhanced 201:4	209:21
1:15 2:4,12,13 3:16	100:3,12,19	easy 144:1	176:2	enormous 157:16	established 39:12
3:23 4:7,17 11:8,16	due 6:24 8:22 11:14	ecological 47:24	elevation 25:23,24	enough 9:18 14:12	106:12 119:13
11:19,23 12:10,14	97:7 131:23 146:11	economic 72:4 73:4	32:17 34:14,19	31:19 72:12 88:10	140:18
15:10,10,12,20	169:16 188:18	93:5	61:24	99:6,21	establishes 74:16
16:10,11,12,14,15	223:20	economical 213:12	eliminated 21:24	enquiry 19:17	establishing 75:5
17:2 19:17 20:6,16	Dul 42:18	eco-flow 107:12,13	elongates 41:14	ensure 3:10 78:2	estimate 73:2,3
20:21,22 21:7 23:15	duly 157:6	Edison 66:4	elsewhere 121:25	204:11	et 14:1 18:22 26:17
24:5 32:4,10 34:2	dumps 45:25	educating 182:17	166:20 168:6,14,16	ensures 197:21	31:15 41:3 45:9
35:13 51:24 52:10	duplicative 137:15	effect 2:20,25 6:20,23	Embassy 2:7,8	ensuring 117:1 162:3	48:7 62:1,5 135:17
54:19 56:25 57:22	duration 77:20 88:23	7:8,14 87:1 112:4	embodied 8:15	203:18	etc 188:19
59:9,10,15 60:20	104:21 112:1	119:12 123:8,15	emerge 109:25	entail 152:22	Europe 110:13
61:7 75:11 102:15	during 3:19 4:15	126:13 129:9 130:9	emergency 129:4	enter 86:14 223:8	evaluate 214:6
111:12 112:24	27:16,18 28:10,21	130:25 133:15,20	152:13,16 198:22	entered 166:25 167:10	evaluation 73:5
113:6,10,11 212:24	29:2,4 31:7 32:25	134:2 136:23 139:2	199:19 205:5	enters 41:5	evapotranspiration
213:2 218:15 219:2	38:17,19 39:8 68:22	139:3 140:1 142:6	eminent 134:14	entire 21:21 28:11	49:15
draft 188:7 190:12,14	77:6,11 82:3,22	143:22 145:16,21	emphasis 184:24	34:18 60:2 85:14	even 17:18 38:19
191:7	83:5 84:4 88:2	146:16 155:2,5,25	emphasise 10:24	97:24 143:15	46:19,20 49:25 58:1
drafted 169:6 171:20	95:16 97:13 99:11	156:5,11,16,22	170:14 207:4	entirely 23:17 67:20	60:13 80:1 81:2,21
drafters 190:9	99:17,23 106:1	157:13,24 158:5,11	emphasised 118:6	191:16 213:9 220:8	82:17 87:21 90:3
drafting 150:15 191:3	118:25 154:21	161:11 162:15,19	152:24 153:10	entitled 178:1 187:18	94:13,18 95:6
drafts 8:22 187:19	161:24 169:12	163:23 166:1 174:1	155:10 156:1	197:5 204:2	100:19 120:13
dragline 45:23,23,24 46:1	187:11 201:1,4	175:21 176:1,12,14	188:13 215:14	entitlement 10:5	126:11,20,21
drainage 45:4 197:11	duty 137:12,17 160:12 160:14 215:21	176:18,20 177:6,6 177:24 178:15	emphasising 189:18 190:17	187:16,20,22 207:19	132:13 142:9 147:11 176:16
drains 40:5	dynamically 106:19	180:8 181:17	employ 152:20	entity 55:21	192:11 201:19
drams 40.5 dramatic 14:17 15:25	dynamicany 100.17	196:25 203:25	employed 28:7 34:1	enunciated 159:7	207:23 209:8,12
65:24 165:8 166:13		209:13	empty 6:9 28:16,17	environment 14:23	223:15
dramatically 65:16	e 178:6 184:12 189:23	effective 64:4 126:20	30:11,13 40:9,15	40:25 47:20,21,23	evening 1:11 68:22
67:8 92:20	191:13,15 192:4,7,9	147:10 151:3 216:7	218:15	48:12	77:6 97:2,7,11,14
draw 3:13 10:21 26:24	192:16,21,25	effectively 16:12,21	emptying 47:11	environmental 5:11	97:22 98:5
30:12 33:10 39:22	193:11,17 196:12	75:9 99:18 108:4	enable 64:3 78:23	44:8 54:17 97:8	event 20:23 21:3 26:3
40:1 47:7 96:4	197:23 198:19	116:24 138:25	207:20	103:14 166:21	27:17 30:22 40:14
168:2	200:23,25 205:12	161:16 172:21	encapsulate 150:14	214:5,25 215:9,22	45:5 55:3,3 56:5,10
drawdown 6:9 23:22	205:17,22 206:3	186:22	encourage 73:17	222:8	56:17 162:10,24
25:14 27:15 28:1	212:20 219:18	effectiveness 150:22	end 11:5 26:23 29:8	environments 54:11	165:18 166:7 169:1
30:25 39:23,24 40:8	220:6,10	effects 138:8 214:6	34:7 39:2 40:13	envisaged 66:12	170:1 194:10
41:16 47:17 127:24	each 3:6 70:17 71:13	effet 194:17	43:13 65:15 114:16	189:19 190:12	events 27:19,24 28:21
129:2 132:25	72:23 74:22 81:12	efficiencies 80:14	114:19,23 147:10	equal 89:6,7	29:11 32:25 40:21
151:20 152:6,20	87:4 89:5 92:3,4,8	efficiency 38:2 65:14	147:25 149:9	equally 141:9 147:8	61:22 163:13
153:1,6,10,19	121:19 127:8,16	83:15,17,20,23	163:16 180:23	163:19 equation 24:17 43:7	eventually 105:21 187:9
154:11,16,21	138:25 139:6,6,7,23	efficient 126:20 eggs 48:3,4,5	200:15 217:13 224:3	equation 24:17 45:7 equilibrium 36:4	
155:12,23 156:9 157:1,11 158:12	141:15 151:4 187:1	eggs 48:3,4,5 Egypt 19:19	endeavour 10:21	39:11	ever 2:8 evermore 7:11 8:1
159:14 160:2,8	200:16 203:11	EIA 214:7,10,13,18	endeavouring 4:14	equipment 22:25 82:2	every 8:7 57:4 78:10
161:15 165:3 175:1	204:23 208:11,17	215:15	endeavours 204:4	104:13 107:5	84:8 86:23 87:5,5
177:12 178:3,4	211:3 217:20 218:4 earlier 80:6 119:5	EIAs 216:2	ends 50:17	equitable 49:25	89:19 111:24
216:5,6,20 221:20	120:13 126:7 132:3	eight 77:8 88:12	end-user 94:8	166:25 167:10	139:16 213:14
drawdowns 29:15	138:1 148:20	either 17:22 30:1 32:7	end-users 72:18	equivalent 18:21	everybody 18:17
drawing 29:17 39:19	152:24 157:13	33:16,16 57:24	energies 67:7 70:22	31:13 46:11 160:23	46:17
drawings 11:25 12:4,6	158:18 172:2	58:15 65:6 79:20	100:15	167:4,5 185:14	everyone 1:3 115:15
12:7	176:20 178:8,14	110:5 162:7 164:25	engage 4:5 135:4,13	erga 129:9	220:24
drawn 28:4 118:2	181:21 201:11	165:19 166:11,14	engaged 191:1	erosion 13:23 14:8,10	everything 79:6
draws 97:4	206:2,8 219:17	198:15 208:22	engaging 142:25	16:10 17:21	everywhere 61:15
dredge 23:3 45:18,22	earliest 66:3	209:2	209:15	errors 136:4	103:7
46:3,12,12	early 13:1,1 66:10	elaborate 116:11	engineer 4:12 5:14	especially 47:21 48:14	evidence 20:24 194:5

Page 7

Trevor McGowan

Amended

	I				
214:20	183:23 186:22	169:16 196:17	facing 13:1 153:5	2:23 5:17 6:17 8:11	74:11,11,17,18,20
evident 65:21	Excuse 206:8	explained 46:19 140:4	fact 5:2 54:21 97:12	114:11 115:4,16,17	74:20,22,23,24,24
evidential 3:10 8:6	executing 204:22	149:3 154:14	121:21 122:1 134:4	115:19,25 131:22	75:4,6,7,12,23,25
evolution 20:25 63:5	exempted 44:13,13,19	161:17 175:20	136:16 137:20	132:10 133:18	76:6,8,22 77:15,18
63:25 92:2 106:9	exercise 71:23 116:22	201:14 213:3	140:17,21 141:22	143:10,25 145:11	77:20 89:8 93:13,13
111:18	135:15 137:13	218:16	144:6,14 145:24	146:18 149:25	104:24
evolved 66:7	159:15,16,17 175:4	explicit 128:16 142:14	146:7 147:21	150:12,18 158:4,9	first 1:7 2:7,8 6:24
evolving 107:16	exercised 159:19	144:25 158:13	154:14 155:18	163:20 164:13	7:23 20:23 24:10
111:23	160:4	161:16 167:8	169:1 170:17 173:9	166:3 167:4,13	52:1 53:7,8 59:10
exact 59:2,21	Exhibit 112:16 131:20	explicitly 126:5 136:9	174:8	168:12 170:6,12	59:17 65:1 67:23
exactly 3:12 17:13	217:12	140:7 141:23 142:8	factor 14:9 47:5 88:14	171:7,8 179:9,24	76:17 116:15
33:8 49:11 111:2	existence 140:17	163:13 164:22	105:2 196:7 216:19	180:13 181:1,8,15	118:13 119:7,17
113:22 163:9	existing 61:12	168:22 176:22	factors 47:5 57:5	181:24 182:3,15	120:8 123:6 125:6
192:24	exists 73:19 137:9	express 154:5,7	78:12 105:20 162:6	200:6	126:11 127:19
examination 151:15	expanded 20:19	158:25 186:10	164:10,24 166:10	Fietta's 5:17 6:22	130:13 139:1,19,25
Examining 140:3	expansion 63:18 71:23	192:5	175:5 195:2 213:15	fifth 196:17 222:14	140:3 151:23 157:8
example 24:8,9 25:20	73:8 74:13,18	expressed 81:15,16	213:16,16	223:11	160:11 162:15,20
26:19 27:10 36:10	expansive 217:5	209:19	factual 122:15 146:2	figure 38:1 66:17	176:24 183:13
36:22 39:1 43:21	expect 7:19 52:12 59:6	expresses 10:11	fail 18:8 76:19	67:11,21,22 68:1,4	184:2 185:8 186:12
46:18 56:22 69:16	66:21 102:1 109:13	186:15	fair 113:25 170:6	68:7,10 69:23 92:19	186:19 187:19
71:5 78:24 90:14	114:11 145:12	expression 50:13	fairly 101:18	95:7 97:23 111:16	194:5 195:4 200:24
107:5 132:24	221:10	expressly 6:13 132:17	faith 151:6,8 194:16	111:17	203:2 214:4 217:16
145:23 146:1 149:5	expectations 73:6	133:13 134:7 193:2	fall 174:10 191:11	figures 67:23 94:22	221:15
153:4 161:14	expected 90:11 168:1	193:23 194:1 195:5	219:22	file 113:16	firstly 63:13 64:5
167:25 184:24	208:4	195:18 197:8,9	falling 99:10 121:19	fill 17:19 38:24 41:24	fish 40:16 44:8 48:3
185:20 188:17	expensive 22:18	206:25	172:13 173:7	41:24 87:20,22	Fisheries 44:7
202:12 213:12	experience 4:19,22	extend 144:5,10,19	179:14 223:12	88:10 95:17 97:2	fit 5:7 89:10 97:2
221:18 222:6	experiments 30:23	164:20	falls 61:8 82:11	filled 26:4 29:2	fits 122:9
examples 150:3,10	53:13	extended 70:8 95:15	169:22 172:1,24	fills 120:2	Fitzmaurice/Waldock
189:2 218:8	expert 5:14 7:5 113:1	128:25 135:15	173:24 222:12	filter 41:22	10:7
exceed 90:11	116:21,23 117:10	198:20	familiar 118:14	filters 98:10	five 69:21 134:18
exceeds 189:1	117:15 118:1,6,12	extending 163:23	119:19 146:23	final 63:25 69:11	195:2 197:13
Excellent 224:14	118:19 119:6,8,10	extends 173:22	far 27:11 45:13 54:14	121:12 123:7	221:13
except 36:13 129:3	120:13,20 121:1,11	extensive 21:8	122:17 125:23	129:11 131:8 134:9	fix 212:11
141:4 152:12 159:1 184:11 186:3	121:14 124:15,16 125:3,16,18 126:25	extent 3:2 23:23 95:15 100:2 121:10 144:8	126:12 133:3,11	140:12,25 141:20	fixed 32:14 66:6 219:6
			135:10,17 204:23 farm 90:10	142:16,21 144:3,4,9	fixing 217:19
196:11,22 198:6 200:14 205:17	128:6,13 129:7,20 130:3 131:2 134:13	144:18 145:1 150:5 152:21 156:15	farms 14:18	144:23 145:20 146:3 147:4 151:8	flagged 193:19 flat 25:12
excepting 190:19	134:24 135:4,12	164:15 172:23	fascinating 57:4	151:23 156:16	flattens 21:13
excepting 190.19 exception 8:18 10:9,11	136:22 137:7,20	181:9,25 191:17	fast 166:17	157:24 158:11	flatter 109:4 111:20
10:13,15,17 123:15	138:2,10,15 139:4	203:24 204:10	faster 95:8	161:20,23 162:1	flawed 6:2
156:13,21 158:5,12	139:12,21 142:3	211:23 212:4	fastest 89:18	163:14 167:8 168:7	flexibility 87:18
158:13 162:13,16	151:8 156:7 159:20	222:12	fast-reacting 95:5	168:12,14 172:11	103:11,13 212:6
162:17,20,22	159:24 160:16	extra 36:20	fatally 146:9	172:18 174:16	flip 18:3,7 84:9
163:25 164:11	161:13 163:17,19	extract 203:23 204:2	FATIMA 2:7	179:22 181:6,13,16	flipping 84:12
166:5 183:8 187:10	167:19 168:9,15	extracts 131:25	favour 73:16 110:15	188:12,23	flood 27:16,18 28:3,4
187:20,23 188:1	169:19,21 172:6,17	extracts 131.23 extraneous 212:21	feasibility 74:1	finality 148:9	28:22 32:25 39:8
193:9 194:2,20,21	172:24 173:6,10,14	extraneous 212.21 extraordinary 56:17	feasible 24:11 46:17	finally 10:20 43:16	46:16 52:17,20,21
194:24 195:5,18	173:17,22,25 174:6	extreme 29:11 58:15	46:18 216:11	103:21 142:17	53:23 54:25 61:14
196:2,11 197:10	174:10,15,19 176:3	58:15	features 47:17 218:9	183:20 205:6	199:19 202:15
202:23 204:9	176:15 177:7,11	extremely 72:21	February 7:2 123:19	financial 72:1 91:22	204:18,18,22,23
205:18 218:18	178:24 179:3,13,17	106:16	130:8,21 131:13	find 10:12,13 19:12,12	205:3,3 224:10
exceptions 9:5,13 10:1	179:20 180:1,15,22		fed 5:8	32:6 55:14,20 78:5	flooding 54:3 61:15
10:2,4 156:15 157:8	181:5,10,22	F	federal 44:4	89:10 103:11 109:2	floodplain 18:23,23
157:21 183:8,24	expertise 134:20	f 124:17 135:7 160:23	feel 4:2 8:7 115:3	finding 129:9	floodplains 31:15
193:15 194:8 195:7	experts 2:21 5:5 6:21	172:15 173:9,13,20	169:13	findings 6:7 145:24	floods 30:4 32:1 52:16
195:8 196:13	124:8 136:25	173:24 174:5	feeling 170:7,8	146:2,7 155:3	flood-control 52:18
202:22 217:6	157:25 160:6,24	179:14 180:10	felt 167:7	160:25 173:18,18	floor 1:7 82:3 94:5
218:21	172:10,12 178:21	212:20	few 51:25 70:24 77:6	fine 36:16 106:7	flopping 40:17
excess 41:8	178:22	face 21:13 35:23	79:10 102:25	113:18 114:7	flow 9:3,12 16:22 26:3
excessive 14:6	expert's 5:21 6:14	140:20 152:7 195:5	115:14 122:19	143:12 158:4	31:10,20 32:25 33:6
exchange 8:21 217:23	129:11,13 130:22	faced 45:10 148:17	138:17,18 143:13	170:23 207:3	38:17 48:2 53:4,25
exchanges 5:4 9:15	130:25 174:24	153:25 214:19	191:14 198:11	finer 112:3	53:25 56:3 75:5
98:14,16	176:1 177:25 178:8	faces 17:12	fewer 57:14,18 103:17	finger 17:13	76:24 81:2,4,6,10
excluded 158:6	explain 35:10 63:2	facilitate 137:14	field 5:15 41:2 51:15	fingers 44:11	81:24 82:15,17
excludes 195:14	109:12 119:25	facilities 79:16 91:1	136:12	finish 131:13	83:16,19 84:16,18
excluding 20:19 38:2	120:15 126:22	100:5	Fietta 2:11,11,12,12	finite 19:25 124:11	87:25 88:2,16 96:8
exclusive 32:7 123:11	136:20 142:7	facility 11:25 210:16	2:13 3:16 2:17,19	firm 73:9,10,20,21	101:13 108:3,11,15
		•			
	•				

Page 8

Trevor McGowan

Amended

108:16 162:9 165:3			1		
	221:13 224:17	full 34:20 40:4 49:12	154:15 156:21	71:19,21 91:24	86:16 100:8,14
				-	
165:5,13 166:8,10	follows 44:18 142:3	84:4 199:12,18	158:18 159:18,21	110:21 114:4,9	101:8,24 102:4,17
166:21 183:4 184:4	follow-up 41:2 220:18	215:3	160:3 161:10	184:24 191:25	102:18 108:11
184:6,14,20,22	fora 117:2 138:13	fully 9:7 39:13 70:12	162:19 173:15,17	210:15 215:3 223:1	110:18 111:11
185:3,5,8,11,15,18	forced 34:25	87:10 179:10	176:7 177:22	given 5:20,25 16:23,23	127:15 131:23
185:21,22 186:5	forecast 72:3,4,13	full-loaded 88:6	194:13 202:1	20:23 34:22 49:22	138:18,20 139:5,14
187:25 188:11,17	73:11,13,19 74:15	fulsome 123:2	generally 15:15 54:18	58:11,18,18 74:16	139:25 156:13
				' '	
188:23,25 190:19	Foreign 2:5	function 80:14 81:9	56:22 72:4 73:25	76:24 81:6 92:21	163:17 164:5
192:2 193:13 202:3	forgo 24:12	83:10,22 104:23	77:7 83:12 89:20	98:20 120:17 161:5	183:15,25,25 186:8
202:7,16 211:18	forgone 46:23	149:7	90:22 93:10 128:24	161:8 163:1 168:1	190:6 195:14 197:7
214:22	form 111:8 120:2	functionality 7:12	130:19 135:8 142:2	168:20 181:12	198:9 199:25
flowing 28:20 189:3	141:7,15,19 145:19	functions 81:22	151:13 159:2	189:2 190:15 221:8	207:10 208:11
flows 23:24 26:12 31:7	184:15	116:22 209:20	165:12	gives 30:7 31:23 32:2	gold 96:24
				O	
31:11,22,24 42:16	formal 141:11 211:12	fundamental 166:8	generate 15:21 21:18	46:5 71:21 188:24	gone 18:7 55:2 58:7
42:20,23 123:10	formally 162:17	fundamentally 66:8	42:20,23 88:3	212:6	103:23 125:23
161:23 162:4	format 4:4	100:8 148:19	100:10 187:18	giving 19:16 43:21	126:12
214:24 215:2,7	formed 155:14 158:14	further 5:14 62:7	197:5 218:1	86:5 133:15 170:19	good 1:3,3 11:9 12:9
fluctuate 29:3	forming 140:23	102:13 107:11	generated 68:8 69:3	global 63:14 65:7,11	12:14 24:9 26:14
fluctuations 94:18	forms 161:18	113:19 131:8 177:9	76:23 77:17 91:9	65:19	37:14,18 55:15
				globally 64:14 69:4	-
101:11 112:10	formula 75:4	179:5 182:17	generating 16:5 23:1	C .	57:23 58:10,16 60:5
188:17 199:9	forth 206:20	214:23 223:23	71:15 79:16 81:4	GLOF 54:24 61:22	62:6 94:16 98:21
flush 23:9 24:21,23	fortnight 202:14	future 2:21 12:22	generation 15:16 63:6	GLOFs 54:10,14	109:15 115:10,15
30:8 31:24 39:19	forward 77:24 103:19	16:24 106:13 128:1	63:15,18 65:13,16	56:23	115:20 151:6,8
42:4,5,7 47:6	129:19 161:16	129:5 138:3,15	66:16,25 67:1,16	go 10:2 16:18 17:22,22	161:14 194:16
flushes 30:13	179:10 190:25	142:21 153:2,7	68:10 71:23 73:8	23:4 25:2 32:3	223:17
			74:4,13,18 75:8	34:14,14,25 37:3	goodwill 217:19
flushing 6:9,9 13:25	forward-looking	154:17,22 155:16	' '	1 1	S
23:8,22 24:10,13,16	162:22	156:7 162:4,8 163:5	79:3 83:5 84:21	38:6 40:11 46:14,15	219:10
24:19 25:2 28:24	fossil 23:12	165:7 172:22	87:19 88:19,21 89:3	51:5 53:6,11 56:13	Gorges 39:2
29:10,10,15 30:21	found 26:14 75:25	178:10,21,21 180:1	89:12,18 90:1,4,7	57:18 64:5 70:2	governed 128:14
30:23 31:4,17,19	169:15 184:18	208:24	90:12,13 91:3,4,7	72:8,10 73:4 84:8	191:18 192:9,17
32:7,12,14,16,23	foundation 1:19 2:9		92:12 94:14,16 95:4	96:19 102:13	governing 149:12
	4:12	G	97:15 100:7 104:12	103:19 111:19,24	159:6 168:21
33:1,5,6,8,12,14,22				· ·	
34:16,18 35:1 39:19	four 12:17 13:15	G 1:1 122:12 140:8,12	109:1 111:25	113:7 115:4,21	government 55:19
40:10,13,21 41:12	52:24 63:12 77:7	141:3 142:6 160:22	183:10 187:14,25	116:7 122:6 130:10	governor 81:21,22,24
41:14 42:4,16 43:4	87:6,13 121:19	167:21 223:6	195:18,21,24	132:12 133:4	82:6,11,16,18 83:13
43:15,19,25 44:20	127:15 138:8,10,12	Gandaki 36:23 37:6	196:20 197:19	142:11 143:11	83:23 84:16 107:6
44:23 45:5 46:22	138:13 141:14	gaps 120:2	201:4	147:23 152:9	108:6
47:11,22 50:15	183:12 185:6		generations 65:8	164:15 167:25	governors 108:1
T		GARTH 2:19			
51:10 127:25	fourth 156:19 196:7	gas 68:3 79:14 87:19	generator 80:7,15,19	170:6 177:9 179:16	gradual 67:9
132:25 151:20	222:9	91:11 93:19,23	80:20,23,25 81:1	180:22 185:10	gradually 40:11
152:6,21 153:1,6,10	framed 134:7 185:11	97:17 103:24	82:24,25 108:14	106.0 100.6 100.25	
153:20 154:11,16	framework 212:5		02.2 .,28 100.1 .	186:8 190:6 199:25	grandparents 65:5
154:21 155:12,23	Hamework 212.3		generic 134:23 137:2	207:10 213:24	grandparents 65:5 graphic 43:6
		gate 30:15,16 222:2	generic 134:23 137:2	207:10 213:24	graphic 43:6
156.9 157.1 11	213:1,10,11 216:12	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9	207:10 213:24 220:24	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6
156:9 157:1,11	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11
158:12 159:14	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geologic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geologic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10 GREGORY 2:13
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 freedom 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10 GREGORY 2:13 grid 5:7 37:14,16 70:4
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10 GREGORY 2:13 grid 5:7 37:14,16 70:4 70:5,6,9 78:4 80:8
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20 front 21:14 56:8,12	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3 63:9,14,17 64:6	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23 108:8	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16 41:16,22 42:7,9	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10 GREGORY 2:13 grid 5:7 37:14,16 70:4 70:5,6,9 78:4 80:8 90:22 98:9 109:6,11
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23 11:14 72:6	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3 63:9,14,17 64:6 66:13 69:24 71:18 93:5 117:24 118:3	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10 GREGORY 2:13 grid 5:7 37:14,16 70:4 70:5,6,9 78:4 80:8
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20 front 21:14 56:8,12	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3 63:9,14,17 64:6 66:13 69:24 71:18 93:5 117:24 118:3 126:12,17 128:1	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23 108:8	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16 41:16,22 42:7,9	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23 11:14 72:6 following 2:12 4:17	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequenty 94:20 frequenty 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20 front 21:14 56:8,12 65:21 fuel 23:12 78:23 91:10	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23 108:8 getting 1:18 2:8 16:16 18:12 107:8 146:10	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16 41:16,22 42:7,9 43:15 44:7 46:14,15 47:19 48:19,22	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10 GREGORY 2:13 grid 5:7 37:14,16 70:4 70:5,6,9 78:4 80:8 90:22 98:9 109:6,11 grids 69:21,22,24 70:13,17 71:3,13
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23 11:14 72:6 following 2:12 4:17 5:16 8:11 19:17	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20 front 21:14 56:8,12 65:21 fuel 23:12 78:23 91:10 93:21	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3 63:9,14,17 64:6 66:13 69:24 71:18 93:5 117:24 118:3 126:12,17 128:1 129:5 130:15 132:23 136:22	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23 108:8 getting 1:18 2:8 16:16 18:12 107:8 146:10 Ghazi-Barotha 22:7	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16 41:16,22 42:7,9 43:15 44:7 46:14,15 47:19 48:19,22 49:12 50:1 53:1,17	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23 11:14 72:6 following 2:12 4:17 5:16 8:11 19:17 32:11 99:4 126:14	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20 front 21:14 56:8,12 65:21 fuel 23:12 78:23 91:10 93:21 fuels 65:22 67:3,5,25	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3 63:9,14,17 64:6 66:13 69:24 71:18 93:5 117:24 118:3 126:12,17 128:1 129:5 130:15 132:23 136:22 137:12,17,24 143:6	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23 108:8 getting 1:18 2:8 16:16 18:12 107:8 146:10 Ghazi-Barotha 22:7 gigawatt 81:15	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16 41:16,22 42:7,9 43:15 44:7 46:14,15 47:19 48:19,22 49:12 50:1 53:1,17 58:10 61:12,15,20	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10 GREGORY 2:13 grid 5:7 37:14,16 70:4 70:5,6,9 78:4 80:8 90:22 98:9 109:6,11 grids 69:21,22,24 70:13,17 71:3,13 grossly 72:25 ground 40:17 170:22
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23 11:14 72:6 following 2:12 4:17 5:16 8:11 19:17 32:11 99:4 126:14 127:17 130:20,24	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 freed 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20 front 21:14 56:8,12 65:21 fuel 23:12 78:23 91:10 93:21 fuels 65:22 67:3,5,25 68:2,7 72:7 91:10	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3 63:9,14,17 64:6 66:13 69:24 71:18 93:5 117:24 118:3 126:12,17 128:1 129:5 130:15 132:23 136:22 137:12,17,24 143:6 143:7 146:19	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23 108:8 getting 1:18 2:8 16:16 18:12 107:8 146:10 Ghazi-Barotha 22:7 gigawatt 81:15 gigawatts 81:17	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16 41:16,22 42:7,9 43:15 44:7 46:14,15 47:19 48:19,22 49:12 50:1 53:1,17 58:10 61:12,15,20 62:24 63:12 64:21	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10 GREGORY 2:13 grid 5:7 37:14,16 70:4 70:5,6,9 78:4 80:8 90:22 98:9 109:6,11 grids 69:21,22,24 70:13,17 71:3,13 grossly 72:25 ground 40:17 170:22 grounding 63:9
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23 11:14 72:6 following 2:12 4:17 5:16 8:11 19:17 32:11 99:4 126:14 127:17 130:20,24 149:21 177:15	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20 front 21:14 56:8,12 65:21 fuel 23:12 78:23 91:10 93:21 fuels 65:22 67:3,5,25 68:2,7 72:7 91:10 94:1	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3 63:9,14,17 64:6 66:13 69:24 71:18 93:5 117:24 118:3 126:12,17 128:1 129:5 130:15 132:23 136:22 137:12,17,24 143:6	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23 108:8 getting 1:18 2:8 16:16 18:12 107:8 146:10 Ghazi-Barotha 22:7 gigawatt 81:15 gigawatts 81:17 give 1:16 2:5 11:12	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16 41:16,22 42:7,9 43:15 44:7 46:14,15 47:19 48:19,22 49:12 50:1 53:1,17 58:10 61:12,15,20 62:24 63:12 64:21 67:14 74:19 77:24	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23 11:14 72:6 following 2:12 4:17 5:16 8:11 19:17 32:11 99:4 126:14 127:17 130:20,24	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 freed 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20 front 21:14 56:8,12 65:21 fuel 23:12 78:23 91:10 93:21 fuels 65:22 67:3,5,25 68:2,7 72:7 91:10	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3 63:9,14,17 64:6 66:13 69:24 71:18 93:5 117:24 118:3 126:12,17 128:1 129:5 130:15 132:23 136:22 137:12,17,24 143:6 143:7 146:19	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23 108:8 getting 1:18 2:8 16:16 18:12 107:8 146:10 Ghazi-Barotha 22:7 gigawatt 81:15 gigawatts 81:17	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16 41:16,22 42:7,9 43:15 44:7 46:14,15 47:19 48:19,22 49:12 50:1 53:1,17 58:10 61:12,15,20 62:24 63:12 64:21	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11 48:4,4 gravels 35:20 46:2,3 48:2 gravity 80:13 grazing 14:6 great 16:24 79:11 160:2 greater 8:13 77:4 93:11,14 101:8 198:12 greatly 14:8 53:25 green 67:11 97:19 139:10 GREGORY 2:13 grid 5:7 37:14,16 70:4 70:5,6,9 78:4 80:8 90:22 98:9 109:6,11 grids 69:21,22,24 70:13,17 71:3,13 grossly 72:25 ground 40:17 170:22 grounding 63:9
158:12 159:14 160:2,8 161:15 165:4 175:1 177:12 178:3,4 216:5,6,20 218:15 221:20 focus 1:19 2:8 5:9 8:12 15:7 92:9 164:14 169:7 218:15 221:3 focused 24:16 50:4 219:2 focuses 14:4 focusing 4:23 18:11 33:2 50:11 folders 116:6 follow 75:14 78:14 84:1,16 95:10 followed 2:13,23 11:14 72:6 following 2:12 4:17 5:16 8:11 19:17 32:11 99:4 126:14 127:17 130:20,24 149:21 177:15	213:1,10,11 216:12 217:1 218:25 Francis 83:15 free 4:2 169:13 freeboard 124:20 192:22 freedom 110:21 frequency 54:12 66:6 78:14 80:21,22 81:22 82:24 83:3,25 84:17 86:18 100:25 108:13 frequent 94:20 frequently 84:20 fresh 142:25 Friday 8:10 113:10 150:2 199:7 friendship 217:20 front 21:14 56:8,12 65:21 fuel 23:12 78:23 91:10 93:21 fuels 65:22 67:3,5,25 68:2,7 72:7 91:10 94:1	gate 30:15,16 222:2 gated 124:21 gates 27:16 28:3,8 30:10,13 32:15,16 32:16,19 40:16 42:1 52:15,17 56:8 82:10 82:12 108:9,11 212:8 gateway 169:4 223:8 gathering 168:5 210:19 gathering-together 222:22 gave 178:13 gear 82:5 general 2:6,19 26:8 57:19,25 59:4 63:3 63:9,14,17 64:6 66:13 69:24 71:18 93:5 117:24 118:3 126:12,17 128:1 129:5 130:15 132:23 136:22 137:12,17,24 143:6 143:7 146:19 149:11 152:6,8,9	generic 134:23 137:2 152:20 153:9 154:9 155:2,11,25 158:10 158:13 159:16 161:15 Genocide 149:4 geographic 69:24 geologic 62:5 geological 60:7 213:16 geology 17:4,6 19:15 geomorphically 31:13 geopolitical 94:3 Georgina 1:23 geothermal 89:22 92:4 germane 146:15 gets 29:2 30:10 34:15 34:15 37:8 48:4 49:4,5 89:13 97:23 108:8 getting 1:18 2:8 16:16 18:12 107:8 146:10 Ghazi-Barotha 22:7 gigawatt 81:15 gigawatts 81:17 give 1:16 2:5 11:12	207:10 213:24 220:24 goes 4:22 8:21 10:17 19:4 21:14 38:16 44:5 45:25 46:22 53:18 71:22 72:14 82:14 107:24 108:18 110:10 135:10 157:20 175:7 198:8 going 7:24,25 8:4 9:15 14:21 15:7,14 17:21 17:22,24 18:3,16 19:10,11,13 20:13 20:19 21:5 22:2 24:23,24 28:18 29:24 30:15 31:16 31:25 34:16 35:23 36:1,4 40:15,16 41:16,22 42:7,9 43:15 44:7 46:14,15 47:19 48:19,22 49:12 50:1 53:1,17 58:10 61:12,15,20 62:24 63:12 64:21 67:14 74:19 77:24	graphic 43:6 grateful 224:6 gravel 26:25 43:11

Page 9
Trevor McGowan
Amended

		ı	ı		1
grown 65:10,19 67:2,7	heater 110:24 111:3,7	hold 152:13	202:1,13 211:7	ILC 193:23	incentivise 110:3
growth 63:15 64:8,17	heavily 7:22 8:3	holding 28:13 158:12	212:10 218:7	illustrate 64:8 67:14	incentivising 79:21
65:20,24 66:15,17	103:14 196:18	158:14 161:9,15	220:11 221:22	78:6	incidental 188:16
66:22 67:3,7,9 69:4	held 127:6 128:12	177:12	222:17	illustrated 41:5 63:22	189:2
72:4		holdings 120:5 125:1	hydrological 97:8		include 78:12 84:21
	155:13 189:24	0		67:10 90:2 104:14	
guaranteed 148:10	191:2	136:21 144:11	hydrology 27:19	200:21	89:21 145:9 146:12
190:18	help 31:3 42:6 113:16	152:20 158:17	42:24 47:16 50:4,5	illustrates 94:15	191:6 214:15
guarantees 183:23	122:8	holistically 221:5	61:3 75:21 81:7	illustration 77:22 87:1	included 94:10 104:7
guess 33:18 144:1	helpful 11:10 35:11	home 111:3	91:21 96:8 98:7	illustrative 156:18	105:20 135:21
guidance 43:22	56:22 59:7 62:9	honest 87:11 101:25	100:18 104:24	imagine 30:12 34:5	160:11 184:22
guideline 126:3	107:23 113:21	102:24	208:23 219:3	52:22 86:23 108:20	193:23
129:15,19,24 130:6	169:17 192:15	honour 105:15	hydropower 5:6 22:22	163:10 165:16	includes 70:9 72:2
136:15	222:25 223:25	hope 1:8 50:9 92:19	39:3 57:12 62:25	immediate 223:20	117:23
guillotine 114:23	helps 15:20	113:11 115:20	63:3,8,10 65:19	immediately 114:10	including 4:6 44:7
Gujarat 90:16	HEP 3:9 6:16 62:20	224:7	66:11 69:16 70:25	impact 54:14 60:4,5	54:11 56:10 114:15
Gulland 1:23	124:4 125:19	hopefully 65:8 171:1	72:8 75:19 76:3,13	60:16 145:16	120:10 125:12
Gurez 215:1	131:18 135:6,11	hoping 114:9	76:22 79:4,23 80:3	200:20 214:5	136:15 141:19
GW 69:10 86:9,21	137:6 157:14	horizon 111:15	81:3,21 83:6,12	215:18	142:2 157:25 164:9
90:15	175:12,16,21 176:3	horizontally 89:5	84:3 85:1 87:17,24	impacted 53:8 54:22	164:25 166:18
50.15		host 89:22		54:24	172:21 180:14
Н	178:1,9 218:9	hot 111:6	90:1,12,14 91:13,13 92:5,25 93:4,8,11		
	HEPs 2:14 3:22 4:22			impacts 43:20 46:24	183:8 212:18 213:8
Hague 1:5	4:24 5:1 117:20	hot-water 110:24	95:17,21 96:14 97:5	49:10,12 53:9	214:25 218:14
half 27:22 30:1 37:5	120:14 123:10,17	111:3,7	98:21 99:1,11,14	214:23	inclusion 154:5
43:12 51:1 58:2	123:20 124:6 126:3	hour 22:20 92:23,24	100:1 101:21	impaired 38:1	158:25
HAMDIA 2:7	128:2,17 129:5,25	93:2 113:22 170:25	102:16 103:9 105:3	impeded 185:21	incompatible 118:21
hand 33:1 182:18	151:13,21 153:2	hourly 87:16	213:8	implement 69:8	118:24
183:1,6 189:14	155:12,16,20,20,22	hours 19:20 68:22	hydros 102:9	implementation 69:10	inconsistent 6:3 117:3
handful 184:23 186:9	156:24 157:2,18	75:19 77:1,6,8,18	hydro-electric 186:21	implementing 13:8	119:9 136:18 137:1
handles 38:25	158:1 159:14	78:20 81:15,16	187:18 200:10	implications 24:19,20	145:17 201:18
handout 138:23	166:19 178:4,10	85:19 86:5 88:12	217:9	210:19	incorporate 27:12
183:18 208:10	her 8:24 114:14	94:17 95:3 98:5	hydro-solar 98:24	implied 139:17	197:22,24 215:2
happen 19:13 38:4	172:24 174:3,4	101:19 111:4	H.E 2:6	importance 120:3,6	incorporated 3:3
44:3	herself 186:22	house 94:23		162:2 163:1 169:8	incorporating 3:9
happened 166:12	high 14:2,21 21:16	household 75:18		189:5 190:5 209:11	2:14 5:1 62:20
happening 85:5	28:22 29:24 31:7	203:4	ICIW 122:25	important 16:8,9	increase 14:10 44:16
109:24 133:6	37:23 40:3 48:17,19	household-scale 90:10	ICJ 148:2 149:3,18,21	21:25 30:2 35:25	49:13 54:12,16
happens 16:25 20:22	48:20 58:22 163:4	huge 51:15 114:15	168:2	36:18 64:2 67:6,17	82:13 84:9 93:4
23:8 25:4 30:16	164:21 213:3,6	human 65:1	idea 22:16,17 24:7	67:17 68:16 70:20	98:9 109:3
	higher 26:22 31:11	Humphrey 193:19		74:12 75:1 77:9,24	increased 35:23
33:9	34:19 61:21 77:13	196:3	59:4 70:18 110:15	81:19 83:8,10 84:23	increasing 49:14
happy 113:15 219:11	88:11 94:8	hundredfold 14:10	194:2	88:13 90:18 94:2	66:19,20 67:11
hard 78:8 82:5 97:22	highlight 184:1 186:9	hundreds 90:9	ideal 19:1	95:22 100:7,18	93:12 103:5 203:15
166:17	190:8 198:11	hybrid 106:23	Ideally 20:6 83:19	104:3 105:2 121:6	incumbent 160:18
harm 52:4,9 215:22			ideas 106:20	125:21 151:3	
harness 217:8	highlighted 66:9	hybridisation 98:18	identical 120:21		indeed 6:25 118:23
having 23:25 42:10	128:22 148:12	98:25	identically 87:5	157:10 160:9	150:12 213:10
43:16 44:19 46:11	156:20 176:24	hydraulic 19:18 30:7	identification 72:2	164:11,19 173:21	independence 186:24
94:12 148:25	highly 134:25 173:10	36:6 38:5 108:7	identified 72:9 74:2,8	174:2 192:10	independent 73:17
155:22 157:6	high-flow 201:2	hydraulics 51:6	124:12 162:14	208:18 209:16	81:6
182:10 192:4	high-level 116:13	hydro 3:24 2:25 8:14	211:8	214:8	Indian 7:4 54:20,21
204:16	him 4:1,2,3,6 75:14	8:16 55:15 67:9	identify 122:10	importantly 94:10	69:13 120:14 123:1
hazards 202:15	130:16 174:3	68:14 79:25 84:24	identifying 164:12	127:25 161:8	123:10,17,20 126:3
head 34:8 47:18 80:11	Himalaya 3:22 14:2	94:14 95:8,9,22	iii 2:25 8:19 9:8,9	173:12 175:15	128:8 129:18 131:4
81:4 217:4	14:21,24 17:21	97:3 99:17 100:6,9	135:20 183:13,14	imports 98:13	138:3 151:13,21
headline 10:12	26:14 27:14,23 28:6	100:19 102:1 104:5	183:22 185:7 189:5	imposed 175:14	154:23 155:12
heads 187:15 190:12	35:15,16 46:20	106:22 107:5,6,14	189:7 193:7,15	200:11	156:24 157:2 158:2
heaps 91:9	48:14 50:16 55:4	182:21,24 186:10	194:22,23 195:6	imposes 202:11	159:14 175:10
hear 1:20 2:10 3:8	Himalayan 3:3 12:12	189:10 192:3 197:4	196:2,9 197:2 202:5	208:25	178:4,10 211:7
heard 3:7,19 178:15	38:21	200:2,14 202:18	202:22 205:2 217:4	imposing 9:24	215:25 218:9
181:21 187:8	Himalayas 15:13,17	205:14 207:25	217:5,6 218:19	impounding 20:11	India's 9:2 109:14
198:19 208:5 211:5	32:5 54:11 60:25	210:3 217:3 219:4	III(2) 186:1 197:9	205:25	117:19 123:2
218:7	himself 135:13	hvdroelectric 8:19		imprecisions 112:2	125:23 126:8,14
hearing 1:7 1:17 2:6	historic 162:6	9:13 10:9 63:21	218:21	improvements 14:14	127:12 130:20,22
S	historical 49:19 66:25	83:10 136:13	III(2)(a) 202:25	65:14 90:22 93:7	131:15 132:11,16
3:7 5:3 18:12	historically 12:19,24	183:10,15 187:3,14	III(2)(b) 204:7	improves 90:23	133:9 134:6 136:16
104:22 177:17	67:3 70:2	187:25 190:13,16	III(2)(c) 205:6	improving 98:11	154:18 155:8,9
199:25 222:21	history 65:1 113:8	191:8,18 192:17	III(2)(d) 195:18	185:3	176:25 177:21
224:17	160:1	195:17,21,24 196:2	III(4) 189:21 196:8	inadequate 214:8	187:13 190:12,14
heart 218:23			205:15	_	· ·
heat 49:14 111:8	hit 41:11	196:19 197:3,5,22	II(1)) 185:2	inappropriate 160:15	194:19 195:8
I	I	I	I	I	1

Page 10

Trevor McGowan

Amended

	T	T	ı	ī	ī
196:18 200:16	initial 107:17	interest 48:10	99:7	136:1 137:6 141:21	jumping 94:21
201:9 205:9 208:14	initially 34:20 206:9	interested 15:13 20:22	inter-state 167:10	144:6,13,14,24	jumping-off 4:9
210:5 211:17 214:7	injects 82:11 108:7	20:25 24:2 113:13	introduced 43:23	156:23 164:15	June 96:21 191:7
indicate 145:12,18	injunction 195:9	133:6 220:25	introduces 186:1	171:10 173:1,12	jurisdiction 149:23
166:22 168:23	196:8	222:21	introducing 112:6	176:13 179:1	174:12
indicated 39:12 79:24	injury 215:10	interesting 12:23 13:6	186:18	181:19 182:8	jurisdictions 43:19
128:25 131:12	innovations 213:7,9	18:18 23:7,16 25:20	introduction 15:12	200:23 211:8	166:24
147:2 152:10	216:25	32:10 45:16 71:2	71:19 116:14	213:23 222:14	jurisprudence 119:23
153:16 163:13,25	innovators 66:4	92:8 109:23 165:15	introductory 11:10	223:12	120:1,10 144:21
206:9	input 74:18	203:13	inundated 55:8	item 30:2	145:18 147:13
indicates 139:10,11,13	inputs 74:13 98:3	interests 210:11	inundating 54:6	items 76:15 98:19	168:18,24 169:5
144:21	210:8	interest's 64:8	invalid 130:24	iv 121:20 138:10	194:7
indicating 26:3 36:2	inserted 188:21	interference 183:5	invariably 135:1	IV(12) 203:9	justice 147:7,14
45:20 117:11	insight 4:19 11:12	184:7 186:18 187:3	invert 27:9	IV(2) 204:21	Justice's 215:13
indication 154:25	105:22	188:9,14,19 195:10	investment 58:8 73:12	IX 1:1 2:21 119:13	justify 125:19
indigenous 45:8	insights 105:18 212:25	195:11 209:3,8	73:16 79:21	120:9 127:9 140:14	
individual 74:21 76:9	insignificant 188:16	intermittent 68:20	investments 79:20	140:20 142:5 143:1	K
104:17 124:13	189:1 190:20	internally 5:3	investors 79:21	146:6 173:5 180:23	Kali 36:23 37:6
134:25	insisted 26:6	international 134:20	invite 11:7,16	211:9	Kantoush 43:10
individuals 134:19	insofar 174:2 184:16	135:16 142:7 143:8	invocation 214:17	I(10) 203:1	Kashmir 41:11 56:2
indulgence 224:6	197:5	144:18 146:21	216:23	I(11) 204:9,15 205:4	70:11 190:20,23
Indus 1:2 2:4 7:3,12	instability 19:22 39:25	147:4,5,6,8,14	invoked 215:25	I(15) 188:5	Kathmandu 37:13
16:10 17:15 18:12	installation 94:22	150:19,23 160:14	invoking 214:11	I(9) 205:7	KC 2:9,11
19:3 22:5 41:9	installations 104:2	160:19 167:3,16,24	involve 117:15 205:1		keep 28:7,8,10 33:12
66:10 67:13 69:15	installed 45:24 67:15	168:18,24 169:2,4,5	involved 37:10 66:12	J	114:24
70:10 71:11 75:3	67:18 69:17 70:15	184:17 194:7	72:20 92:12 104:1	J 2:14	key 73:7 74:13 81:23
102:12 118:25	88:3 201:15	215:13 222:6,7,11	105:23,23 106:21	Jagran 56:2	91:3 92:25 95:1,5
127:4,16 149:16	installing 57:13	222:15 223:4,9,13	107:9 112:7 113:12	JAMAL 2:8	149:14,15 197:15
150:25 168:22	instance 13:20 17:15	interpret 136:5	involves 44:4 175:5	Jammu 70:10 190:20	keys 98:8
184:19 190:22	27:20 30:19 36:5	160:13,18 194:1 218:20	188:3,16	190:23	KHAN 2:5
208:9 209:17	42:17 48:3 52:15	interpretation 3:14	iPad-enabled 11:24 IRENA 92:1	January 130:13	KHEP 6:12 123:2,9
industrial 64:15 70:5 203:5,10,15,17,23	53:5 55:6 58:5,22 108:22 109:19	2:11,18 6:7 7:13,25	Iron 215:20	Japan 26:19 43:10	125:13 136:16
203.3,10,13,17,23	221:8 223:15	8:9 115:24 116:2	irrespective 128:12	Japanese 43:11	152:2,21 153:7
industrialising 66:21	instances 221:16	117:24 118:3,11	irrigated 18:20,23	JEFFREY 1:11	154:5 155:6 161:25
industries 186:13	instead 28:13 31:21	121:7,22 122:13	205:11	jeopardy 145:22	178:10 214:22
203:7	41:10 125:17 126:2	123:13,14 124:10	irrigation 19:8 30:18	Jersey-Maryland	KHEP/RHEP 117:17
industry 98:17 106:16	155:22 196:9	128:5,7 129:14	41:23 49:14,15	78:4	kill 41:20
inertia 95:10 99:3,4,6	instruction 152:19	131:17 132:14	52:23 53:2,19	Jhelum 190:22 202:9	kilometre 59:3
99:10 100:25	instructive 127:3	134:22 135:3,5,15	197:11 205:9	206:12,17,21 219:21	kilometres 18:20
inevitable 106:13	intact 56:19	135:23 136:10,19	ISLAMIC 1:16 2:2	job 86:20	22:10 27:2,12 37:13 39:5 53:15
120:24	intake 25:16 37:8,22	137:2,21,24 138:1,2	isolated 70:4,5 71:3	join 8:8	kilowatt 22:20 75:19
inevitably 131:17	37:24 38:2,13 56:8	140:16,21 153:12	85:15 106:25 109:6	joins 206:17	81:15 92:22,24 93:2
inextricable 195:23	56:13	154:1,12,19 155:8	issuance 156:25 157:3	Judge 1:10 167:13	kilowatts 81:17
inextricably 208:19	intakes 21:14,15,23	157:11 158:11,20	issue 8:7 15:18,20	judgment 148:16,22	kind 13:6 111:18
infeasible 43:20	48:7 124:22 201:23	158:24 159:8,23	21:10 29:16 32:8	149:10 150:4 158:6	165:19 220:12,18
inflow 85:4	integral 198:6	163:12 168:23	35:18 52:21 68:24	165:21 215:14	kinetic 80:18
inflowing 46:13	integrate 64:1 88:25	169:19 174:25	91:3 113:6,17 122:1	judgments 150:18	KING 2:20
inflows 112:19	106:22	175:15 182:5 188:3	122:16,23 129:10	judicata 126:23 142:6	Kingdom 2:7,8,9
influence 57:16	integrated 3:10 2:15	192:1 193:22,25	131:4 132:13 133:2	142:13 143:2,6,22	kink 37:24
inform 106:11 170:17	5:2,7 62:21 63:1,14	194:12,14,19 196:5	133:4,9 135:17	144:17,19,25 145:3	Kishenganga's 155:25
210:10 219:23	70:7 71:3,9 85:15	217:2	145:5 150:6 152:18	145:18,20 146:8,16	Kishenganga/Neelum
information 54:19	89:25 96:23	interpretations	153:20 158:10	146:19 147:1,3,18	161:24 162:12
85:24 94:6 208:20	integration 63:8	128:13 135:18	160:8,17 165:13,19	147:24 148:6,14,24	knew 56:23
210:2,12,20	intended 4:8 5:12	157:23	168:16 171:16	149:2,4,22 150:21	know 3:24 4:21 8:25
information's 96:21	171:22,23 202:2	interpretative 3:9	172:9 175:1 191:4	156:10 157:9,13,23	15:17 18:17 24:15
information-sharing	211:1,4	8:12 10:23 126:17	191:12 216:4 222:9	158:5,7,15 161:19	48:10 49:13 50:12
208:7 211:2	intending 166:16	152:7 158:17	issued 116:17	161:22 162:2,14,18	54:1,20 58:15 67:23
informed 215:8 216:2	intense 191:1	159:16,18,21 160:4	issues 3:14 2:16,18 3:4	162:18 163:23	92:3 103:1 105:15
222:5 223:4	intensity 54:12	160:6,10 161:9	3:19 4:6 5:13,16,24	164:7,12,20 165:11	134:17 135:21
informing 150:10	intention 171:21	173:15,17 218:18	6:4,17 7:10,24 8:1	165:22 166:2,5	169:25 201:21
informs 205:14	interactions 133:16	interpreted 194:9	8:12 17:25 45:6,7	172:4,25 173:2	206:1 209:16
infrastructure 22:21	interconnected 69:21	218:4	50:11 115:24 116:2	174:1 177:6 180:8	216:13 220:6
48:7 52:2,3 53:9	69:25 70:12	interpreting 211:25	117:18,18 118:3,5	judicial 143:8 146:21	221:24
infused 189:10	interconnection 69:19	interruption 47:9,10	118:10 119:1 121:6	147:7 167:25	knowledge 203:21
inherent 25:1 60:24	70:20 98:11	52:13,22 53:22,24 54:2 202:17	122:2,12 124:3,11	July 1:6 1:1 116:4	known 21:1 174:20
inherently 134:21 inimical 126:22	interconnections 70:24	interruptions 94:3	127:11 131:7,15 133:10 135:24	141:8	Kotri 19:2
minicai 120.22	70.24	meer upuons 94.3	133.10 133.24	jump 149:25	Kulekhani 15:22
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Page 11

Trevor McGowan

Amended

	lawyer 23:17 135:2,2	22.12.26.2.2.2.7.0	100.1 202.0 10	I I 2-0 10 10 11	174.17 101.4 107.0
L		33:13 36:2,2,3,7,9	198:1 203:8,18	London 2:9,10,10,11	174:17 181:4 187:9
L 2:13	lay 48:3 121:6	36:12,19 37:23	204:20 205:21	2:11,12,12,13	190:21 191:5 200:9
la 174:7	layer 1:18 2:7 3:9	38:16 39:9,10,20	limits 60:24 127:12	long 19:25 20:1,4 39:5	212:24
Lafitte 124:2 135:13	layout 74:2 201:15	40:11 74:1 75:20	131:3 166:22 203:9	88:10 107:15 144:2	magnitude 199:8
Lafitte's 6:1 175:22	lays 48:4	81:24 82:3,17 85:20	205:8	185:13	main 61:17,18 63:12
laid 6:6	LCOE 94:5	91:2,3 99:8 108:14	line 19:17 32:14 33:10	longer 26:16 58:23	64:23 89:20 146:7
lake 54:25 190:22	leading 7:1	109:3,10 129:3	39:21 66:16 67:11	65:9 85:14 162:11	148:22 161:2 202:8
lakes 55:7	leads 72:17 199:12	152:11,11,23	97:3 204:19 215:1	163:6,7 164:20,24	mainly 92:9 103:2
land 14:11 16:6,7	learn 51:5	198:23 199:5,12,13	lines 167:8	longest 45:13	maintain 29:5 31:17
25:12 205:10	learned 13:10	199:18	link 212:25	long-term 17:5	32:24 81:22 82:20
landscape 16:4,5	learnt 13:12	levelised 92:9	linked 194:17 208:19	look 9:8 15:5 23:7	108:2 202:2 209:20
	least 1:22 20:7 32:8	levels 29:3 32:21	liquid 91:10	32:21 37:1,3 39:18	maintained 123:7
landscapes 16:17	73:9 100:12 134:18	84:17 154:21	Lisa 1:23	44:13 46:9 48:17	124:1
landslide 21:20 54:25	135:2 154:25	lex 168:21	list 124:11 173:6,8	49:3 65:7 66:14	maintaining 202:7
55:7	157:12 170:22	Liberia 106:21	listed 78:2 204:11	80:2 86:22 90:2	216:7
landslides 14:24 15:21	176:14 210:1	licence 205:4	lists 69:10	92:8 93:16 101:24	maintains 28:23
16:3 61:22	leave 103:1	life 111:13 163:24	literally 175:23	113:5 133:5 169:12	maintenance 177:12
language 9:8 143:17	led 69:4 139:22	lifecycle 92:12	litigant 149:10	169:25 179:10	214:21
167:9 187:16	left 32:12 67:22 68:5	· ·	O	182:1 183:16 221:4	major 16:20 35:18
188:13,21 196:25		lifetime 65:7	litre 41:8,12,20		
197:18 212:19	68:10 86:2,8	lifted 20:21	little 2:9 11:12 19:10	looked 24:10 42:11	37:16
Lanka 20:24	left-hand 43:5 56:7	light 68:9 84:9,12	20:12 21:20 26:11	52:11,18 112:16	majority 16:16 67:2
laptop 11:24	79:2 94:16 187:17	114:25 160:13,19	31:10 35:10 37:7	125:9 132:13 148:2	make 3:20 7:18 8:20
large 12:24 15:24 19:9	190:11	167:1 202:21	53:11 57:5 83:24	148:25 158:23	8:23 12:4 13:10
27:17,24 28:21 30:4	legal 2:5,20,20 2:16	like 2:5 4:5 8:6 11:1	91:19 113:24 114:4	looking 4:13 22:13	15:2 22:2 23:5
31:22 32:1 38:25	5:16 47:21 119:12	13:20,21 15:15	114:18 132:1,11	37:19 43:10 56:6	31:18 34:8,25 49:1
41:1 46:19 52:15,16	120:25 121:3	19:18 20:4,9 22:15	169:15 170:10,12	57:13 58:2,4 63:14	50:3 61:25 68:8
52:16 54:21 55:25	122:20 123:4 125:2	22:23 25:3 32:6	171:20 213:15	64:21 67:23 86:20	73:5 79:19 84:14
57:14,18 69:8,14	125:16 126:23	38:15 44:2 45:23	221:5	183:13 184:16	109:14 110:3
70:17,18 82:2,4	127:13 131:10,16	46:5,6,12 48:8,11	live 122:16 196:22	188:3 194:20	116:13 121:17
94:20 96:23 98:3	132:19 134:1,12	49:21,21 51:11,16	198:2,5 199:3,8	202:20	133:24 139:16,24
99:7 104:1 222:12	145:16 149:12	52:19 53:24 57:3	lives 65:18	looks 52:19 107:17	151:25 163:7 167:7
largely 67:4 68:2 70:6	150:23 157:12	58:20 59:3 60:7	LLOFs 54:10,14	lose 18:8	170:21 171:1
97:7 161:23 201:10	177:19 182:6,13	65:4 71:19 77:10	56:23	loss 15:25	173:17 189:9,19
larger 26:16 39:16	213:1	84:23 94:24 101:1	LLP 2:11,12,12,13	losses 90:20	makes 43:24 68:13
46:1 57:25 76:23	legality 151:18 153:10	102:25 107:18	load 14:15 19:9 26:18	lost 12:6 17:16 20:10	85:23 134:14
98:12	154:10	108:9 110:22 112:1	26:18 27:8,8,9,22	20:12 155:3	140:10 141:11
	legally 125:24	113:4 116:12	35:17 37:2,5,7 38:2	lot 13:3 16:20 20:9	158:25 168:20
largest 39:3 69:5,13	length 170:20 208:17	122:19 141:7,20	38:13,23,24,25 39:4	23:13,25 25:5 27:25	172:16 187:24
89:23 97:16	lengthy 135:14	143:20 164:11	43:17 46:10,13,14	30:25 40:21 41:25	188:13
large-scale 215:22	less 1:22 21:17 22:19	168:19 170:14	46:15 47:17 48:18	42:6 43:18 44:10	making 48:9 71:2 88:9
last 1:9 7:21 54:8	30:6 31:13 57:25	219:25 222:3	48:18,20,21,22	45:6,8 46:22 49:22	99:4 107:17 134:7
57:11 67:8 103:21	59:19 61:21 77:1	liked 15:12	59:23 60:1 77:20,22	50:10,24,25 51:12	189:14
111:11 133:22	84:5 88:3 132:1	likely 54:11 94:13	78:15,17,19 83:2,13	51:16 55:11 58:7	manage 12:18,21
141:8,23 204:16	146:24 150:24	210:11	83:24 84:1,4,19	89:13 98:17 102:23	15:18 20:14 49:8
220:25			7 7		
late 65:2	203:21	limit 164:5 169:7	85:22 86:15 87:3,19	104:22 105:16	52:20 57:20
later 77:13 96:5 136:3	lessons 13:12	190:3,21 200:16	87:24 88:6,23 95:10	106:17 199:6 200:1	managed 1:9 20:3
137:23 139:9 143:5	let 1:16 8:23 9:3,11,17	217:24 218:1	99:4,10 104:14,20	lots 25:4 138:19	52:8 71:14
143:12 150:16	15:2 17:18 22:2	limitation 61:9,20	108:18,19,22 109:8	low 31:10 35:17 39:10	management 12:15,18
171:14,25 179:19	25:7 31:4 53:10	95:2 154:6,8 156:14	109:9,13,16,17,22	39:25 48:18 56:5	13:8,11 14:2,4,12
179:21 181:3	62:7 105:8 169:25	158:13,25 159:11	110:11,17 111:10	58:22	23:18 24:8 35:7
203:22 219:23	183:4 184:4,6,14,19	162:13,15,19,20,22	111:14,25 115:22	lower 26:21 94:13,13	42:23 47:16 51:14
latest 116:5 136:12	185:8,11,15,18,22	181:1 206:20	213:6	103:12 112:19	52:3 57:23 59:11,13
latitude 114:19	187:25 192:2	limitations 57:6 61:11	loading 104:16	186:17	60:2,21 109:25
latter 94:2 95:25	193:13 211:17	62:2 63:23 95:6	loads 14:20 29:24	lowered 41:12	110:1,9,19,19,20,23
121:23 126:24	220:24 221:9	107:5 156:16 157:8	48:19 85:11,11,12	lower-right 68:9	213:8
LAURA 2:12	letter 7:2 43:22 130:21	157:21 191:16	85:12 88:11 199:11	low-flow 76:3,4	Manager 2:21
law 45:9 126:13	131:13 186:12	202:6,12 206:23	213:4	lunch 113:22 114:5,10	managing 37:7 54:15
134:20 135:16	187:2	213:17	load-stacking 109:2	115:20 170:11	mandatory 196:25
136:4 142:7 143:6,7	letters 130:12	limited 14:3,3,24	local 44:9 98:10		199:24
144:6,6,14,18	let's 30:9 34:8 36:1,22	41:16 43:5,14,15	locally 71:7 92:16	M	Mangla 14:19
146:20 147:5,7,15	39:18 44:25 49:2	88:16 91:21 99:14	locate 35:1	Maître 124:2 135:13	mangle 9:19
160:14,19 166:24	50:6 80:2 115:6	100:17 102:18	located 37:12 90:19	175:22	manifest 122:23
167:3,16,22,24	179:19	103:11,13 145:13	196:8	made 51:12,15 71:3	manifestly 120:9
168:19 169:2,2,4,7	let-flow 161:1 195:8	154:4 159:1 160:5	location 34:22 201:14	121:16,19 129:13	manipulate 218:5
	195:15 204:14	165:5,25 168:14	locations 50:22 155:22	134:1 137:1 141:7	manner 32:11 70:1
221:6,14 222:6,8,11	level 3:5 17:19 28:8,9	172:13 173:6	202:9	153:22 160:9,25	137:13 219:1
222:15 223:4,9,9,13	28:10,10,13 29:4,5	176:14 177:6	locked 51:17	161:9 163:19	many 12:25 19:19
lawn 2:2	29:6,13,14,18 33:11	185:18 190:15	logical 24:10	169:20 172:14	43:19 50:13,14
lawsuits 45:10	, ,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		9	107.20 172.14	

Page 12
Trevor McGowan
Amended

Day 3 Hearing on	the Merits, First Phas	e		We	dnesday, 10 July 202
57:15 58:19,20 62:5	206:25 208:22	29:23 40:19 42:11	minimum 23:10 28:8	127:4 128:9,24	201:13 216:24
70:3 73:14 74:7	215:10,17 221:11	43:3 53:3 54:9,9	29:5 39:20 40:20	132:11 133:15	MUHAMMAD 2:4
93:22 104:2,6	222:20,20	58:6 60:20 108:19	112:18 161:23	134:6 135:25	multidisciplinary
110:20 112:2	maybe 23:10 29:11,11	165:2 180:10	162:9 165:2,5,13	141:14 142:1	134:18
114:12 119:25	29:11 33:16 35:10	191:12 198:13	166:10 212:11	144:25 151:13	multipurpose 39:7
146:25 147:12	51:19 55:18,19,20	206:25 220:10	214:22,24 215:2	159:3 160:5 162:21	municipal 203:4
172:7 178:19	55:21 58:1,2,21	mere 216:22	mining 203:7	165:10,14 166:5,16	Murphy 1:10 10:17
man-made 188:10	59:2 100:23 169:11	merely 76:10	Minister 186:13	171:20 172:13	must 3:3 10:3 73:20
mapping 55:13	170:25 213:11	merit 119:18 149:24	Ministry 2:4,5	176:14,25 178:22	74:17 76:6,8 78:1
March 127:20	221:12	merits 1:7 6:25 7:23	minor 78:10 85:5	184:6 192:13 203:5	79:18 80:20 84:11
Marine 44:7	McGowan 1:23	message 43:13	94:18 101:11	203:20 208:10	85:25 86:15 91:5
market 73:16	mean 13:1 22:11	met 163:10 197:20	minute 22:3 85:24,25	221:5	98:4,5 126:19
marketing 91:23	37:23 50:12 61:1	method 77:19 112:12	111:20	Moreover 159:18	134:25 136:11
markets 73:14,20	98:24 103:13 108:4	112:15	minutes 25:3 78:20	morning 1:3 3:15	141:12,13 142:18
marks 216:16	112:18,19 132:5,6	methodology 6:2	95:12 114:19	12:14,15 111:5,6	147:9 149:11 163:7
massage 223:18	143:19 165:15	106:12,18 129:19	115:14 122:19	193:20 194:12	173:10 183:4
massive 21:22	188:22	methods 50:15,20	170:22,25	212:25 224:4	190:18 210:10,15
match 82:13 85:3	meaning 7:14 75:11	51:10 76:18	misnomer 33:7	morphology 16:22	212:8 221:16
89:11 101:13 107:4	142:15 147:17	metre 16:6 32:19	misplaced 136:4	19:23	MUSTANSAR 2:6
107:12	148:6,15 154:1	metres 18:5,6 25:23	mistaken 219:22	Morris 2:13 3:5 1:15	mutual 137:8,17
matched 107:13	194:16 198:13,14	25:24 31:1 32:18,18	mitigate 110:6 215:21	2:4,12,13 3:23 4:17	208:25
matching 184:3	198:25 199:7	32:18 34:8 46:4,6,9	mitigation 40:24	11:8,16,19,23 12:10	mutually 118:20,23
material 26:25 27:5,6	218:20	201:9	mix 71:25 106:23,23	12:14 15:10,20	MW 22:7,10,11 36:24
31:3 35:16,19 46:2	means 15:1 32:7,8	middle 64:16 79:13	134:20	16:11,14 17:2 20:6	39:3 45:4 46:5,6,7
59:24 204:24	33:25 35:4 53:24	92:18	Mm 16:11	20:21 21:7 23:15	54:25 56:3 58:2,2,3
209:13	79:6 82:25 99:20	midst 3:17	model 36:6,6,7	24:5 32:4,10 34:2	58:7,13,14 69:17
materially 56:18	116:24 147:20	mid-1940s 66:18	modelling 107:19	35:13 51:24 52:10	70:16 86:21 90:17
209:5,9	185:15 197:23	might 5:7 7:16 11:20	moderate 58:12 96:11	54:19 56:25 57:22	97:21
materials 212:7 222:1	207:23	23:24 52:9 62:10	97:6	59:9,15 60:20 61:7	myself 105:22 219:20
matrices 138:24 139:6	meant 126:7 169:16	71:6 74:7 93:14	moderating 108:4	212:24 213:2	
139:15,24 178:13	186:4 208:19 219:9	114:3,18 133:7	modes 81:25	218:15 219:2	N
matrix 138:23 139:20 139:21 178:16,23	measurable 60:5 188:25	140:18 143:19 145:14 146:16	modifications 19:6 modify 38:10 49:7	Morris's 3:16 4:7 mosque 56:16	name 32:16
179:10,25	measure 59:25 60:13	163:10,11 168:1	moment 1:24 69:7	most 16:1 17:10 19:3	namely 117:16 118:16
matter 1:1 88:9	177:12 210:8	170:12 191:13	77:23 84:22 158:21	27:17,17 41:20	128:10 151:18
126:13 129:2,12	211:13	219:12 221:7	moments 70:24	64:17 79:16 92:5	152:20 156:23
134:4 142:7,15	measurements 60:6	222:23	Monday 112:12 208:5	93:19 97:11 103:18	narrative 150:13
143:4 169:19,21,24	mechanical 80:5	miles 2:10 75:11	money 23:1 55:20	110:13 159:15	narrow 34:11 187:10
172:19 174:17	mechanism 162:8	102:15 111:12	111:5	209:16 214:8 216:7	194:14 217:4
179:13,21	mechanisms 142:19	112:24 113:11	monitor 82:19	mostly 52:5	narrower 1:19 2:8
matters 117:4,14	media 54:20	148:4	monitored 53:14	motivated 154:14	narrowing 203:11 narrowly 194:3
121:21 137:2,4	meet 71:15 72:12	Miles's 113:6,10	monitoring 40:24	217:8,13	NASIR 2:8
139:11 140:25	73:10,12,19 74:17	milligrams 41:8,11,20	189:19 210:6	mountainous 25:18	nation 66:22 108:21
158:7,8 172:13,17	199:9	millimetres 18:22	monitors 82:9	54:10	National 44:7
173:16 178:25	meeting 71:1 127:20	million 18:2,6,19	monsoon 15:24 18:8	mountains 49:18	natural 30:6 44:16,18
182:18	128:19,20 129:18	23:12,13 37:4,6,6	38:25	61:24	44:22 79:14 91:11
mature 93:6	129:18 130:8	39:4 46:8 201:9	month 23:13 87:6	move 9:19 15:14 21:20	97:17 103:24
maximise 91:22 218:5	meetings 127:5,6,17	milliseconds 107:7	106:19,19	30:8 31:3 32:19	naturally 50:7
maximises 31:7	133:20	mills 64:12 215:14	monthly 72:19 75:18	34:24 35:19 39:1	nature 20:2 31:10
maximum 29:13 32:2	MEGAN 2:13	mimic 44:16,22	210:9	47:7 59:2 115:7	57:11 68:20 120:11
41:13 112:13	megawatt 58:3 86:5	mind 10:25 15:10 51:8	months 38:25 210:1	143:10 163:17	121:15 127:23
129:14,20 199:14	megawatts 77:15	57:7 112:22 167:14	more 2:9 4:21 9:6	167:19	133:15 137:5
may 3:11 8:5 11:21	81:17 86:4 90:9	mindful 157:23	11:12 15:2,15 16:6	moved 13:9	141:24 142:21
23:17 29:12 40:25	MEHAR 2:4	minds 165:1 190:8	20:12 22:2 25:12	moves 30:22 108:9	144:23 147:1 153:1
41:1,2 47:3 55:13	members 1:14 3:6 5:4	213:18	27:23 30:6 31:13	moving 7:4 35:20	153:9 154:9 155:11
60:1,5 68:23 85:4	7:16 10:20 62:22	Minear 1:11 59:8,9	34:4 35:10 43:11	161:16 201:19,24	156:4 157:9 163:3
100:19 102:11	115:19,25 141:14	60:19 107:22,23	49:1,14,15,15 51:19	much 1:8 8:3 11:1,7	168:8,13,15,20
103:15 115:2,4,8	146:23 171:8	108:17 109:12	54:5,18 55:21 56:22	12:9 31:18 51:24	173:7 184:21
119:23 131:23	182:23 224:8	111:11 112:5	57:11,14,18 58:24	54:7 59:5 60:16	210:23
132:19 135:4 141:5	Memoire 186:25	166:24 167:9,17	59:19 61:22 63:10	62:4,5,6,8,14 74:14	near 97:4
142:19 146:10,14	memorial 112:17	184:14 192:24	67:8 70:7 79:18 84:5 89:13 90:3	76:15 91:15 93:11	necessarily 6:23
148:14 150:1	113:3 122:24 140:4	206:6,7,8,12,14,16		96:9 102:2 105:7,13	101:12,23
154:13 155:21 158:4 162:5 164:3,4	143:3 169:14 171:15 19 213:21	206:18 207:3,7 217:23 219:13,16	93:4 100:18,21 101:7 102:2 103:2	112:4 113:18,20 115:9 133:16 134:6	necessary 7:13 32:6
165:7,19 167:13	171:15,19 213:21 221:10 222:19	217:23 219:13,16	101:7 102:2 103:2	135:25 137:9	85:1 119:23 137:8
170:18 173:12	mention 12:2 35:13	minimis 204:13	105:12 104:22	150:14 171:2 172:7	145:1 148:8,14
181:15 191:11	50:19	minimis 204:15 minimise 33:1 111:1	109:20 110:17,19	178:22 182:15	167:23 212:14
192:16 193:25	mentioned 22:23	minimise 33.1 111.1 minimises 47:10	111:4,8 113:5 114:4	189:17 190:8	223:10
			,0 110.0 111.7		necessitate 166:11
		Pag	ge 13		

	162.7 171.24			101.25 110.7	201-25 211-24
necessity 223:6	163:7 171:24	notwithstanding	occurred 55:11	101:25 119:7	201:25 211:24
need 1:21 7:7 8:8 15:6	186:19 190:21	120:4,5 136:16	occurring 108:14	122:20,22 123:3	212:3,17 218:13
30:7 32:10 42:5,8	196:24 197:15,21	no-storage 190:6	occurs 98:2	127:9 131:9 209:22	operationally 199:5
50:6 55:12 68:20	197:23 199:20	211:18	ocean 19:1 89:22	210:23	operative 147:25
85:7 89:14 91:4	203:21 216:9	nuanced 134:6 177:1	off 16:12,15,21 22:11	only 1:9 11:23,25	148:1,15,19 156:8
95:4,12 101:9,10	next 1:18 2:7 16:7	nuclear 5:8 79:14	23:9,11 24:18,19	17:20 19:14,14,17	operator 37:18 71:14
102:21 110:6 115:3	17:3 37:3 42:8	91:10	30:1 40:16 44:14	26:18,22 34:16,17	82:23 86:12,13,15
116:7 119:20 122:6	60:17 61:8 66:24	number 3:3,20 5:4	52:6 65:23 71:17	41:17 55:3 60:1	86:23 97:1
135:1 138:22 164:4	72:14 111:6 115:16	14:16 20:1 37:3	95:16 96:19 98:1	69:17 76:11 83:6	operators 19:2 26:6
165:7 168:17	115:21 122:4	38:10 46:6 53:21,21	110:25 170:15	85:19 86:7,10 88:1	opinion 101:25
180:19,22 181:15	128:19,19,20	53:22,23 54:2,3	offer 91:15	88:14 94:14 95:24	opportunity 3:18 5:13
182:12 194:11	129:17 130:8,10	59:21 61:5,16 77:18	offered 216:11	99:10 104:19 118:4	121:5 170:5 214:15
needed 83:3,25 85:2	133:22 134:8 140:8	101:19 105:20	office 2:6 59:16	120:25 123:15	opposed 103:2 158:5
95:18 100:15 134:8	143:7 151:22 152:9	116:13 122:14	offshore 92:6	124:10,12,17 126:2	165:21 192:8
167:7	153:24 154:11	125:8 145:24	offtake 203:7,8	126:8 129:4 130:15	opposite 111:19
needs 112:9 194:3	159:4 165:17	163:18 182:11	Off-channel 25:15	135:10 155:3	optimal 71:25 105:2
Neelum 206:15,16,18	191:22 198:10	217:25	off-stream 25:8,16	158:16 161:10	175:12 200:9
206:25 219:21	200:1	numbered 121:20	26:1,5	172:12 173:12	optimally 89:11
Neelum-Jhelum 3:20	Nicaragua 145:4	138:9	often 78:11 89:17	174:18 178:24,25	optimisation 107:14
4:6 5:5 27:11 59:12	148:18	numbers 18:18 23:2	111:14 221:25	182:3 185:21	optimising 39:14
59:14,23,24 82:4,22	night 1:9 109:8,21	93:16 201:13	Oh 206:16	188:16 190:20	optimum 73:5
105:16	219:12	nut 58:4	oil 68:3 79:14 82:5,11	191:8 195:7 199:8	option 18:1,25 46:19
negate 221:19 223:7	nighttime 87:23 95:3	nutshell 49:20	108:7	203:23 204:9 212:3	57:14
negated 222:5 223:5	95:18,20 96:1		oil-fired 93:23	214:12 217:16	options 12:15 24:7
negotiation 191:1	Nil 206:21	0	okay 1:25 24:5 30:13	onshore 92:6,23	50:25 51:17 73:2
219:5	Nile 19:19	object 108:2 135:19	62:18 106:5 115:14	on-purpose 52:3	orange 1:10 66:1,16
negotiations 176:20	noise 1:22	136:7 142:15 182:5	167:20 171:6	on-stream 25:9	order 8:8 37:6 46:8
186:11,14	nonsensical 126:19	189:25 194:15,18	182:15	open 27:16 28:2,8	77:7 84:11 88:11
Nepal 15:23 36:25	non-appropriation	200:4,5,18 212:5	omnes 129:9	30:13 42:1 52:16	90:9 106:24 115:17
55:5,8	185:12	217:14 218:21	once 24:23 94:8	73:14 82:12 166:4	116:3,16 118:7,8
net 178:15	non-binding 139:13	219:1,3	114:14 121:10	179:21 216:24	119:17 135:5
Netherlands 1:5 2:7,8	non-consumptive	objected 157:7	200:18 202:16,19	opens 166:1	137:10 148:5,13,23
2:9	190:14 204:8,17	objection 123:19	one 3:14 4:2 5:24 7:18	open-cycle 93:23	183:21 211:13,22
neutral 2:21 5:21 6:13	non-interference 9:3	objections 201:6	8:4 9:8 15:2,22 17:6	open-ended 4:3	218:12
6:21 7:5 112:25	9:12 184:20 186:2	objective 18:11 26:11	17:12,25 18:8 22:2	operable 41:23	ordinance 3:25 170:19
116:21,23 117:10	188:6 192:2 193:14	28:1 32:24 38:9	23:13,21 24:22	operate 15:7 22:13	224:8
117:14 118:1,6,12	195:16 209:12	63:2	27:22 28:25 29:11	29:6,9,12,13 38:11	ordinary 194:16
118:19 119:6,8,10	211:18	objectives 190:2	29:17,18 34:22	39:15 66:5 77:11,19	198:14 199:1
120:19 121:11,14	non-invasive 203:3	obligation 9:11 50:6	35:25 37:10,25 42:7	83:18,19,22,23	218:20
124:8,15,16 125:3	non-operational	161:1 184:3,5,6,20	42:8 43:18 52:1	84:14 87:15 110:22	organisation 92:1
125:16,18 128:6	198:18	185:9,11,15 188:6	53:21,22 55:7 56:1	208:7,8 215:6	organise 118:9
129:7,11,13,22	non-Treaty-based 3:2	194:16 195:8,15,16	58:5,8 61:8,16	operated 83:12 197:16	orientate 122:8
130:3,22,25 134:13	211:23 212:2,17	204:14 209:12,14	68:19 79:4,16 82:2	operates 81:13,19	orientation 118:13
134:24 135:4,12	normal 75:2 115:1	210:13,24 211:18	85:13 88:24 89:5	108:6	orifice 33:21 36:11,13
136:22,25 137:7,20	199:13	obligations 9:3,25	90:17 92:23 93:14	operating 20:8 22:21	178:2
138:2,10,15 139:4	normally 33:21	47:2 208:12,14,15	95:6,25 98:8 106:3	28:9 29:5 38:15,18	original 39:11 201:1
139:12,21 142:3	North 103:19 110:14	217:20 222:5 223:4	106:17 107:24	39:6,20 40:19 68:18	originated 13:5
151:8 156:7 157:25	northeastern 69:22	obligatory 147:22	108:25 109:5 110:2	80:3 81:25 82:24	origins 116:15
159:20,24 160:6,16	northern 69:22 70:9	150:20	111:11 125:21	83:1 84:19,20	others 11:14 19:20
160:24 161:12	70:15	obliged 204:4 209:5	128:20 130:13	198:23 199:16	155:23 158:8
163:17,19 167:19	notable 156:3 159:15	observation 7:18 8:20	132:18 133:22	operation 3:3 3:19,22	182:11
168:9,15 169:19,21	notably 6:7 127:13	8:23 189:18	134:9 137:21	4:23 12:12 29:22,22	otherwise 5:19,20
172:6,10,12,17,23	149:20 153:13	observations 102:25	139:16 146:25	37:21 39:15 42:9,14	131:12 134:19
173:5,10,14,17,22	176:16	103:2	150:1 155:19	59:14 62:25 63:7,10	136:23 140:1 141:5
173:25 174:6,10,15	note 4:7 65:19 66:9	observe 71:2 200:2	163:10 165:16	77:5,10 89:15	142:21 145:20
174:19,24 176:1,15	75:1 86:7 93:2 94:6	observed 117:21	167:21 168:1,5	100:19 102:20	147:14 156:8
177:7,11,25 178:7	97:22 113:24	175:2 193:21	169:10 179:9,19	105:17 117:17	158:18 162:14
178:21,21,24 179:2	125:21 204:15	213:14 221:16	181:14 183:1,6	120:21 123:18,20	163:3 174:11
179:13,17,20 180:1	211:10 216:15	observes 120:20	184:24 187:16	131:1 136:13	175:18 176:12
180:15,22 181:5,10	noted 112:7,12 117:5	observing 148:11	190:2 193:10	156:25 157:3,18	179:3 193:3 224:10
181:22	119:24 123:16	obstruction 188:10,15	196:21 198:4	158:3 159:10	out 21:13 22:8 23:2
never 9:20 38:4 58:18	130:1 162:2 187:2	obtained 90:8 149:11	200:10 204:17	161:25 166:19	24:1,11 26:16 27:23
125:23 126:12	201:11	obvious 49:6	216:6 220:23 221:2	175:12 176:2 200:9	30:13 31:4 38:1,18
133:12,21 134:1	nothing 124:22 147:20	obviously 57:15	221:4,6 222:18	201:18 202:2	40:5,16 41:10,10
175:18	notice 97:3 170:4	113:13 160:21	ones 79:8,13	208:21 210:6 211:3	42:7,10,14 43:7
nevertheless 59:7	208:16	occupying 34:20	one-and-a-half-hour	211:8 216:18 218:6	45:25 48:11 54:20
new 71:25 73:3 90:12	notify 209:5,14	199:17	115:5	222:16 223:12	55:18 56:12,15
94:14 148:24 149:1	noting 185:6 216:14	occur 54:10	ongoing 45:11 63:25	operational 22:22	60:10 67:1 70:14

Page 14

Trevor McGowan

Amended

107 10 124 7 120 7	D 1 11 102 1	11 0604	222 10 15	6 15004545	00.2.215.2
107:10 134:7 139:5	P 1:11 193:1	parentheses 36:24	222:10,15	performed 73:24 74:5	98:2 215:3
140:15 148:16	Pacific 45:4	park 90:15,17	partly 167:7	perhaps 1:5 3:25 4:1	pie 44:11 70:14
154:15 180:16	pack 116:5	parlance 198:15	parts 104:13 118:20	7:16 8:9 10:6,17	pieces 14:11
183:25 184:14	page 169:15	part 3:25 9:11 16:8,9	118:21 141:17	11:19 33:21 101:7	pier 189:3 195:14
185:24 192:24	paid 22:20 55:12	28:2 46:13,15,21	145:2 183:12	154:24 159:15	piers 188:18
193:15 194:4 195:22 196:9,16	paid-for 22:20 Pakal 42:18	49:16,16 55:23 59:17 60:6 70:2	197:13 party 116:5 127:16	162:13 168:9	pinnacle 224:13
197:6,7 202:1,4,4	Pakistan 1:16 2:2,6,8	80:24 82:6 83:8	141:15 146:5,6	169:25 171:19 208:7 221:19	place 15:25 33:19 61:12 89:10 162:8
204:25 206:3	2:8 7:3 9:25 14:19	86:7 87:20,22,23	151:4 162:7 164:25	223:17	207:22 221:8
210:20 211:25	17:7,9,9 19:19	88:2 89:19 94:15	165:19 166:11,14	period 7:1 19:21,22	222:18
217:7 221:9	23:24 27:10 30:24	95:25,25 96:3 97:16	179:19 204:23,24	20:20 30:4 40:10,22	placed 56:14 117:13
outage 78:25	49:5 50:5,7 52:6,12	101:17 110:8,9,25	208:22 209:2,4,5,6	41:15 65:13 67:1,9	117:22
outcome 75:20 146:15	52:19 53:20 56:3	118:12 144:1	209:9,12 222:11	74:7 75:17 76:3,6	places 26:9
outcomes 107:13	90:3 105:25 112:21	145:19 153:21	party's 208:12	77:4,6,10,11 78:19	plain 142:15
outlet 20:18,18 21:4	116:22 119:2 121:5	155:14 156:14	part-load 83:1 84:7	81:13 83:5 92:21	plainly 136:6 141:18
36:20	123:3,6,19,22,25	158:14 161:18	pass 22:14 25:13	96:1,1,10 99:12	plan 57:1 73:2,4,6,12
outlets 201:23 212:12	124:24 127:22	162:18 165:4,6	26:12,18,18 28:4,22	181:1 219:6	74:4,19 114:10
outlines 12:17	128:5,12,21 131:16	167:15 169:2 173:8	32:1 42:20 52:16	periods 17:5 88:10	143:11 217:8
outpace 90:13	141:25 143:3	173:24 176:24	98:1 186:6	92:17 95:15,18	planned 71:20 90:16
output 81:3,8 82:18	150:10 151:25	179:15 187:22	passage 158:21 164:14	Permanent 1:4 2:18	104:6 206:10 209:2
94:20	157:7 161:5 166:6	191:25 195:23	164:18 175:7	147:13 209:17	210:10
outset 211:2	174:20,23 175:17	197:15,15 198:6	176:24	permanently 45:24	planner 99:21
outside 1:23 2:2	181:10,15 182:10	205:13 210:3 214:9	passages 125:14 136:9	permissibility 151:20	planners 79:18
166:10 169:22	183:2 184:3,16	217:16,17 220:25	156:3	153:19 159:14	planning 58:19 63:18
172:1 174:3 180:12	186:6,17,24 187:4,8	224:8	passes 22:9	permissible 185:20	69:11 71:23,24
181:5,11,23 191:11	189:7,12 190:16,24	partial 32:8 83:13	passing 13:23 20:2	permit 44:2,3,19,20	73:15,23 74:8,14
214:2 222:12	191:5 201:17	123:7,22 125:14	pass-through 33:6	152:10 164:19	75:2,8 76:6,13
over 1:6 7:20 17:16,23 18:3 21:4 27:23	202:15 203:14 204:1 208:13 210:9	132:15 141:20	past 2:20 119:12 Patrind 27:10	183:4 184:7 195:10 211:6	77:19 88:19,21 89:3 89:12 98:8 109:1
30:3 46:15 50:13	210:10,13 216:10	151:1,22 152:25 154:13,15 155:11	pattern 44:18,22	permits 202:25 204:7	111:25 113:7 115:5
56:4,11 67:9 75:17	219:3 221:12	156:12,17 157:1,4	64:22 86:13 104:16	permitted 177:13	209:6 215:10
78:19 81:14 92:17	222:21	159:7 174:22	patterns 49:17	189:2 198:1 203:16	plans 69:8 209:6
92:21,23 93:1 97:11	Pakistani 122:25	175:16 200:8	paucity 49:19	220:19	plants 5:6 12:23 13:3
97:21 109:18	128:3 131:12	201:11	pause 1:24 7:17 12:14	perspective 3:4 4:11	13:4,5,7,10,13
111:13 112:20	Pakistan's 5:22 9:1,10	partially 185:21	12:16 63:11 67:24	12:13 15:19 16:18	24:18,19 42:13,21
164:9 198:10 200:1	9:20,22 10:6,10	particular 3:10 4:24	127:3 149:24	52:7 57:17,21 88:19	49:15 51:1 55:9
202:23 204:16	11:13 23:18 112:12	5:10 7:19 9:13,16	158:21 182:18	114:8 134:16	56:13 57:14,15,18
224:7	112:16 116:11,19	32:5 33:20,24 54:5	paused 149:25	157:12,15 202:19	57:19,25 58:12,14
overall 32:24 46:10	122:24 123:24	97:12 98:20 103:25	pay 23:3 47:4 72:19	203:13	63:19 68:17 71:15
58:24 68:18 69:13	125:5,9 127:11	105:19 106:11	PCA 1:3	perspectives 138:13	73:3,9 74:16,19
70:1 76:1 77:22	133:18 134:10,14	111:23 113:6,17	PCIJ 150:20	138:13	77:21 79:13 83:6,11
104:18 221:6	138:4,24 151:11	114:2 121:23	PCIW 122:25 130:8	pertinence 161:21	86:16,21,22 87:15
overflow 31:14	174:13 181:25	122:11,15 129:12	PCIW's 130:12	pertinent 150:8	87:19,22 88:6 90:8
overlap 117:15 118:21	183:23 185:9	135:10 137:6 150:8	peace 1:4 219:4	212:24	90:8,10 91:13 93:17
138:20 overlooks 217:17	186:12,15 190:17 194:4 195:9 201:6	154:2 164:2 165:20 165:25 172:19	peak 53:25 73:21 83:20,22 96:10 97:6	pertinently 164:16 Peru 22:24	93:18 94:5 100:9 101:9 102:1 103:11
overly 145:11	207:5 208:8,13	173:23 172:19	97:11 110:16	pervasive 176:12	103:22 104:19,20
overnight 221:11	209:24 210:11,15	215:18 217:3 221:3	peaking 77:5,9 83:7	pervasiveness 65:17	106:24 124:13
overriding 163:1	211:5 212:2 214:7	particularly 17:9	85:18 88:1 96:1,11	per-megawatt 58:1	126:1 130:17,19
174:12	216:13	28:21 54:4 79:9	99:13 100:11,17,21	PETER 2:14	132:9 136:13 138:3
overruling 161:16	Palace 1:4	123:1 131:5 220:25	102:8,18	phase 1:7 6:24 7:23	144:7 153:7 154:17
overtopped 55:17	pale 97:4,19	parties 49:9 50:1	peaks 77:5 87:21	104:12 121:6	156:4 158:2 159:2,9
overview 3:1 1:13	pan 26:15	116:25 118:24	111:1	phases 118:9	175:10 190:16
63:13 71:18 208:11	panel 106:22	119:14 121:13	peak-period 88:14	Philippa 2:10 115:4	191:18 197:16,22
own 26:13 54:6 57:4	paragraphs 122:12	122:20,22 124:18	peeling 8:13	photograph 25:21	197:24,24,25
65:5 72:5 101:25	124:19 125:7	126:1 127:7 131:3	Pennsylvania-New	45:21	217:25 218:7,10
103:1 122:17	135:17 139:8 140:5	131:25 133:17	78:4	photovoltaic 92:5	220:11 222:17
127:12 137:9	140:7,9 141:16,22	135:9 137:9,14	people 15:4 41:1 51:3	physical 47:17 57:5	plant-by-plant 7:11
154:18 196:10	145:14 148:5 162:1	138:14 140:6,13	55:2,12 76:13 84:12	61:9 103:15 213:15	222:1
201:9 213:14 219:20	163:14 165:17 172:8 15 173:13	141:1,5,9,17,25 142:16,24 143:5	106:19 107:17 110:3,20	physics 66:8 pick 35:5 60:10 84:11	plant-specific 128:24 134:23 151:12,24
owner 15:2	172:8,15 173:13 182:13 193:15	144:10,14 145:16	people's 111:8	94:23 111:25	152:19 159:24
owners 15:4	202:5 205:8 210:20	153:18,22 156:6	per 16:6 22:19 29:12	94:23 111:23 171:17	160:16 161:12
oxygen 48:5	211:11 212:20	167:1 171:25	41:8,11,20 45:17	picked 96:20 97:14	platform 4:9
oxygenated 48:2	parallel 65:10 116:23	172:11 178:20,20	46:6 58:3 66:20	129:15 168:10	PLA-100 185:2
o'clock 115:1	119:8 120:19	179:1 186:3 190:12	67:12 92:22,24 93:1	171:14	PLA-108 148:4
	142:20	191:1 207:15 208:4	percentage 88:24	picks 41:6 46:1,3	PLA-109 149:5
P	parameters 107:2	208:19 211:1 216:2	perform 37:21	picture 16:9,18 55:7	PLA-21 153:12

Page 15

Trevor McGowan

Amended

	I	I	I		
158:24	28:19 29:2 42:22	221:18,24	prevent 137:22	152:13,18	progress 51:12 191:2
PLA-3 151:5 156:20	98:12 198:24	preamble 135:19	prevented 162:16	proceeding 112:8,14	progression 221:7
159:4 175:2 190:1	199:16	208:3 217:16,17	previous 6:20 65:11	112:15,17 113:12	222:23
200:8 201:12	pools 98:14,16	precedent 176:23	116:19 118:17,18	116:24 120:19	prohibit 33:20 207:17
211:10 215:14	poor 14:6 94:19 99:21	177:4,14,18	119:9 121:1,3,10	121:17 122:18	212:10
216:21	100:1	precedential 120:11	125:18 147:13	132:12 182:7,14	prohibited 178:4
PLA-95 146:22	population 66:19	123:4,8,15 124:2,5	151:10 157:24	183:12	189:14 207:24
please 4:2 35:11 62:19	portion 27:18 34:18	125:12 130:15	164:22 173:2 180:1	proceedings 4:25 5:22	216:20
115:17 171:7	60:1	131:10 132:17,22	200:7 220:7	118:9 119:8 120:25	prohibition 6:8 44:23
182:19 219:23	posed 139:1	132:23 133:14,19	previously 33:2,4 43:3	137:15 138:14,15	154:15 155:11,13
pleased 62:22	poses 114:5	134:2,12 136:19	71:4 175:8	138:16 142:3 143:5	155:24 156:1,9
plus 44:9 47:5 61:18	posing 7:20	177:22	pre-Covid 19:6	143:9 146:21 156:7	157:1 184:12
pm 105:11 115:11,12	position 11:13 82:10	precipitation 49:17	pre-feasibility 74:1	176:8 179:2	188:14
_	-				
115:13 171:3,5	125:23 126:8	precise 127:4 133:3	price 94:1 98:21	proceeds 74:4 131:18	prohibits 153:6
179:7 182:20	127:12 128:9	184:6 195:16	pricing 110:14,18	process 39:7 40:18	project 25:19,22
219:14 224:16	130:20 131:3,4	precisely 4:5 7:1,9	primacy 196:5	44:10,12 67:13 72:1	26:20 27:11 36:23
PO 116:17 117:6	132:11,16,20,20	85:3 223:19	primarily 43:8 166:7	72:10,25 73:5,23,24	36:25 37:7,10,12
119:24	133:1,19,21 134:6,8	preclude 155:21	169:8	74:4,14 75:9 89:3	38:9,11,12,23 39:14
podium 1:5 4:18	134:10,11,14	precludes 143:4	primary 64:8,10 81:8	111:25 127:1	39:16,16 45:2,3,4
11:17 150:2	142:13 155:4 166:3	precursors 13:7	169:8 190:2 205:18	186:14 203:17,23	45:14 48:21 53:6,7
point 9:17 11:16 22:2	170:7 174:13	predictability 126:23	principal 52:12	203:25 204:3	54:23,25 57:4 58:8
48:11 49:21 54:8	176:25 177:21	151:2 162:3 163:2	principle 126:24	208:21 209:15	63:4 69:16 71:6,9
59:1 60:13 61:2,21	178:22 182:1	predominantly 90:5	143:6,7 144:17	219:9	74:6 100:1 101:3
62:12 70:14 82:11	186:15 187:7	prefer 193:25	146:19 147:1,9,15	processes 2:22	105:3 106:21
82:14,20 107:17	190:18,24 194:4	preference 58:10	161:21 166:22	produce 16:3,3,5	201:15 213:14
113:16 118:15	207:6 212:2	196:4	167:2 186:1 189:21	27:24 43:17 90:15	projects 27:7 33:14,15
119:16 125:21	positions 82:21 120:8	preliminary 74:2,3	190:6 194:8	94:12 98:20	33:15 35:15 48:13
128:16 130:4	124:23 125:9	preparation 74:6	principles 149:12	produced 1:23 67:19	48:14 50:17,22
133:25 134:4,9	127:11,16 130:11	prepared 105:6	159:7 160:14,20	68:6,13 72:7 75:21	54:21,21 55:15
144:22,25 148:2	131:15,25 132:2	138:22	172:8	76:10,22 81:12	62:25 69:11 71:4
154:7,8 155:17	positive 185:15 210:12	preparing 1:19 2:8	prior 11:12 13:2	85:23 96:24 99:12	72:15 85:1 87:17,24
156:18 158:4,15	possibilities 32:9	prescribe 212:7	143:11 169:20,22	producer 79:7 100:6	89:4 90:25 92:13
164:17 169:11	possibility 21:3 60:20	prescribes 211:12	priority 161:5,6	producers 73:18	93:14 97:9 102:16
170:1 178:12	167:23 169:18	present 62:24 64:9,17	pristine 58:11	103:13,18	130:6 131:18
179:19 181:3	171:22	131:16 138:14,15	private 55:21 73:20	produces 22:19 84:5	215:10
185:16 193:18	possible 23:23 31:18	163:11 176:6 179:2	79:21	108:14	prolonged 28:6 47:12
195:17 200:3,3,16	71:4 90:13 99:13	180:1 197:14	proactively 162:8	producing 22:25	promised 186:25
202:4 222:22 223:3	164:6 222:4	presentation 3:16	probabilistic 72:23	72:16 92:22,23	promising 216:1
223:11	possibly 164:9	4:10 5:1 11:17,24	probably 17:10 25:22	product 66:2	promote 209:21
pointed 184:14 192:24	posture 133:9	24:6 51:25 55:6	29:25 35:23 42:9	production 46:23,24	210:14
pointing 67:1	post-Kishenganga	56:2 59:9 62:8	49:9 53:20 58:12,15	47:10,11 65:19 66:7	prompt 116:7
points 3:20 11:11	133:7	107:25 112:8 113:7	60:3,12,16 222:12	72:15 76:12 77:25	proper 14:22 55:13,23
82:16 163:19	potential 14:3,23 54:1	113:10,21 115:21	224:1	94:19 107:4 191:7,9	136:18 145:13
168:19 171:9 185:6	54:16 57:12 80:5,10	116:9 132:3 139:18	problem 12:22,25	220:12,14	properly 3:11 7:22
212:24	80:13,17 163:25	139:22 181:22	17:10 21:1,23 24:13	profession 57:4	12:4
Pokhara 37:14	165:11 166:1	182:16 191:12	26:6 35:4,21 42:2	professional 50:21	properties 14:10
policy 73:17 79:22	191:17 194:19	200:7 221:1 223:25	43:16 47:13 50:14	Professor 1:10,12	property 15:4
110:18 134:15	217:9	presentations 3:12 4:7	52:12,14 53:21,22	2:10,11 3:25 2:23	property 13.4 proportion 70:17
pondage 26:13 28:12	potentially 118:21	4:15 10:22 11:15	53:22 55:10,22 57:5	8:11,21 9:6 10:17	Proposal 186:25 187:4
28:14,15,15,17,19	146:9 150:14	presented 4:3 87:7	57:5 58:5 94:15	10:19 51:21,24 54:7	proposed 42:18
29:2,9 42:22 56:9	powerhouse 34:6,9	105:15 176:7	97:1,22 107:1	56:21 57:10 59:5	116:22 129:19
75:13 76:25 77:12	35:5 56:18,19 61:8	223:18	110:20 213:15,15	105:10,13 106:5,7	151:19 190:15
84:25 85:7,10,15,17	PO6 120:20 137:11	presently 117:7	problems 25:1 37:9	107:21 114:13,20	215:16
	PPA 46:25	118:22	_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
87:25 88:1,13 101:6	practicable 204:24	preservation 42:3	45:6 46:25 50:2	150:2,12 170:21 171:14 182:17,19	propositions 222:19 propriety 211:15
101:10,10,14,15,21		-	51:2 55:5,11 57:6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
102:13 104:22,22	practical 157:15 170:4	preserve 12:16 154:20	62:1,5 109:5	182:22 191:20,24	protect 166:6
104:25 105:19	practically 175:13	215:7	Procedural 116:3,16	192:19,24 206:6,7,8	protection 44:8 45:9
106:10,12 107:10	188:25 200:11	preserving 26:13	119:17 137:10	206:11,13,15,17,24	204:18,22 205:3
107:12,18 109:14	practice 86:12 184:15	29:20	183:21 211:22	207:4,8 219:16,24	215:9
112:9,13,19,22	208:8 212:22 214:2	president 115:25	procedure 41:4 167:5	220:2,3,4,14,17,20	protective 76:14
119:1 124:20	216:17,23	167:13 190:16	211:12	220:22 221:17	protects 203:14
128:14 129:14,20	practices 3:2 14:6	press 90:15	procedures 40:23	222:25 223:21,24	protest 123:21
130:2,23 192:22	136:12 175:3	pressure 40:6 108:5	72:20 127:9 142:25	profile 28:23 36:4,5	provide 3:17 4:9 5:13
193:1 196:22 198:1	211:24 212:3,4,17	114:2 187:9 191:5	180:23	36:12,19 39:11,12	63:9,22 66:5 68:21
198:6 199:6,12,14	213:23 214:12,12	presumed 211:19	proceed 1:25 35:12	profoundly 174:21	69:9 73:20 83:7,25
199:18 201:22	214:17 215:24	pretty 49:16 82:5	62:19 63:11 115:18	programme 37:19	84:24 85:1,16 91:14
pondering 221:11	216:1,5,8,15,16,25	86:22	171:7,9 182:19	69:8 104:8	91:20 96:14 99:21
pool 28:12,14,15,15	218:24 221:4,6,14	prevalent 93:22	proceeded 151:25	programmes 14:18	99:22 100:1 102:18

Page 16

Trevor McGowan

Amended

104:11 123:2	149:20 168:3 178:3	211:14 219:12,15	reached 137:20	recognise 74:12 88:13	122:20.22 136:21
				0	,
166:25 169:4 202:5	197:14,14 198:18	223:23 224:9	145:24	recognised 126:24	140:12 143:23
210:9,12 214:20,23	203:4,5,10 211:24	quick 36:22 45:1	reaches 158:7	158:19 174:15	183:19 194:2
provided 74:15 80:7	pursuant 1:1 119:13	171:9	reaching 137:23 158:6	recognising 157:12	regarded 181:6,13
87:11 88:15 91:5	173:4 198:19 199:3	quickly 40:1 47:19	react 78:17 82:19	recognition 147:20	regarding 216:2
94:15 97:12 99:25	pursuing 120:19	78:17,21 87:20	84:11 95:9,17 97:1	150:18 164:6	regardless 37:15
100:2,16,22 128:6	215:22	107:3,16	107:7,7	reconsider 166:9	regards 122:16 123:9
131:25 167:6	put 4:2 5:25 10:7	quite 7:21 13:11 14:3	reacting 85:10	reconsideration 162:9	123:9,25 124:4
184:11 188:15	17:13 18:6 20:8	14:3,16 59:22 70:16	reactions 223:2	163:5 166:11	125:15 133:19
196:12 197:20,21	24:17 31:17 32:15	76:14 77:6 108:23	read 54:19 78:9	reconvene 114:3	141:16 142:12
205:2,17 208:9	32:17 34:6,23 35:5	138:17,18 148:2	119:20 138:22	record 12:5 43:24	145:25 154:10
209:18	35:6 36:24 51:8	150:7 175:23 177:5	143:19 165:9,14	119:21 123:3 126:6	156:6,7 158:10
provides 70:20 85:7	55:24 57:7 59:4		175:7 183:25 193:2		T
_		186:14 188:8		127:4,10,19 132:12	160:3,5 166:18
99:1 104:8 119:25	73:1 85:21 98:18	194:10 213:17	197:7 202:4 205:19	133:5,12,23,25	168:18 175:1
141:3 189:7 196:20	104:13 129:18	quotation 153:3	221:9	154:24 162:6	181:10 201:22
203:9 204:21	145:21 153:20	216:16	reading 133:12	182:10	regime-type 43:7
208:11,22 209:1	162:8,10 164:5	quote 131:14	reads 188:14 217:16	recount 122:24	region 54:15 70:9,12
providing 185:3	175:22 189:15	quotes 131:24	ready 1:25 56:13	recur 131:17	70:15
province 103:20	190:24 213:18	quote-unquote 49:7	62:19 115:17,21	red 122:8,13 139:12	regional 69:20,21
provision 10:5,13	216:15 223:19	•	171:7	redesigned 201:7	70:13 98:11,14,15
70:22 83:11 100:20	putative 135:18	R	real 21:7 44:25 65:1	reduce 13:16 154:20	regionally 71:13
102:6 104:10	putting 3:8 13:20	radiation 94:17	216:17	reduced 53:25	regular 51:7
107:18 154:2 167:8	33:18 36:20		realise 95:22	reduces 82:15	regulate 78:13,14
		Rae 2:14 3:11 2:13,16			
167:22 187:13	pyramid 1:18 2:8 11:1	4:17,18,21 5:16	Realistically 20:7	reducing 13:22 14:14	regulated 192:16
188:5 189:11,15,16	P-0227 217:12	62:12,19,22 105:7	reality 162:11 163:6	14:20	222:9,14
195:1 197:7 203:11	P-136 187:15	105:13,22 106:6,15	164:9,21,24 218:13	reduction 60:17 90:20	regulating 200:15
203:14 204:19	P-139 187:21 188:7	107:23 108:6,25	realized 175:23	152:11	regulatory 40:25
205:18 209:11,24	P-227 176:24	109:23 111:16	really 15:6 16:2 18:18	Rees-Evans 2:12 9:16	43:22 45:10 47:21
provisions 79:19	P-23 130:12 131:20	112:5,6,23 113:15	24:17 25:11 26:15	186:7 187:8 190:7	57:6 155:14,19
128:14 136:6 139:7	P-24 128:20	113:20	30:2 32:22 33:7	Rees-Evans's 217:23	175:9 213:16
140:11 141:4 144:3	P-26 130:12	rain 1:10	42:6 49:2 51:4	refer 67:18 76:18	216:19
144:8 180:18	P-420 186:13	raise 171:22	55:24 57:22 58:16	146:5 156:3 167:22	rehabilitation 19:7
183:15 187:4 188:4	P-468 190:11		100:8 112:3 126:8	167:25 183:19	reinforce 195:2
189:23 193:7 197:3	P-548 154:13	raised 11:11 119:10	158:5 163:7 164:14	207:11 215:24	196:25 202:17
197:19 202:21	P-603 78:5	121:7 127:11 131:7	186:10	220:13	
		164:16 180:19,20			reinforces 70:21
210:25	P-612 43:23	181:19	realm 13:9	reference 87:7,11	reinforcing 184:20
proviso 157:10,20	P-70 127:21	raising 21:22	reanalysed 21:10	93:17 120:15 129:9	reinterpret 49:7
174:2		ramp 84:19	reason 6:25 7:8 12:2	139:9 142:11	reintroduce 17:1
préparatoires 9:17	Q	range 18:5 30:7 59:20	reasonable 107:18	148:15 149:14	reiterated 161:21
190:5	qualified 134:21,25	65:17 67:12 214:24	reasoning 129:7 139:5	158:22 160:21	reiterating 130:13
public 44:10 73:20	173:11	215:2	139:14 145:1	171:12,13 184:9	rejected 6:13 129:8
214:15	quality 60:7 78:3	rapid 30:24 64:17	146:13 148:16	191:6 205:3 208:10	130:9 136:9,17
pull 4:14 222:18	128:22 132:7 142:1	66:15,17	150:8 161:17	212:12,15 213:12	151:24 174:24
Pulp 215:14			162:10 163:5,6	221:23	177:20,25
pump 69:9,10	151:11	rapidly 40:5 65:23	164:8,20,23 171:11	referred 78:11 89:17	rejects 131:16
pump 69:9,10 pumped 26:20 80:1	quantity 46:4 186:5	67:2 84:19 94:21	221:7 222:24	91:19 117:14	
	quantum 203:18	106:16			rejoinder 113:3
91:19 104:6,8,11	quasi 120:15	rate 39:23,24 40:8	reasons 3:24 4:3 8:4	124:14 177:17	176:21 177:8
pumping 104:12	quasi-precedential	41:13,16 47:18 75:5	37:10 43:19 61:1,3	178:18 215:20	217:11
pumps 108:8	120:12,16 126:9	76:10,11,24 77:13	120:7 141:13	referring 74:10 206:2	relate 105:14 165:19
purchase 47:1	questionable 135:14	81:2,4,5,6,10,24	143:19,21 145:8,10	refers 89:20 169:18	191:13
pure 56:8 144:19	questions 3:6,7,8,12	82:17 83:16 84:18	145:15,19 164:4	185:2 208:3	related 59:10 90:6
147:23	3:17,18,19,20,21,22	88:2 96:9 108:3,15	reassembled 62:18	refill 29:9 40:12	105:1 117:4 119:1
purest 147:24	4:1,2,3 4:1,1,2 5:9	108:16	171:6	reflect 75:2 112:24	123:12 124:9,20,20
purported 129:8	7:7,20 11:12 51:20	rated 83:19	reassembling 115:15	183:17 198:13	124:21,21 131:15
purporting 136:5			reassessment 219:8	200:5,14 202:22	137:5 144:6 151:6
purports 218:11	51:23,25 58:23,24	rates 14:8,10	recall 5:9 7:2 8:16	223:21	160:1 171:11
purpose 3:8,16 63:9	62:7 105:9,12 106:4	rather 4:4,19,23 12:7	59:12 67:17 76:17	reflected 139:15	relates 52:1 54:8
1	107:24 109:12	27:8 36:14 41:1		179:24	192:22
71:24 135:19 136:8	111:12 113:2,19	47:12 49:19 53:21	82:23 101:23 127:3		
142:15 149:15	114:12,15,16	57:18 104:18 114:4	161:22 212:24	reflecting 5:3 113:9	relating 118:10 141:2
182:6 189:25	117:24 120:21,22	115:5 145:8 164:11	recap 116:15	192:11	141:6 152:1 160:23
194:15,18 200:4,6	120:24 121:2	176:25	receive 50:7 53:8	reflections 24:2	167:18 181:18
200:19 204:11,18	123:12 124:9	rationale 148:21,25	183:2	reflects 189:24,25	184:25 208:23
205:24 209:19	131:16 134:21	149:4 159:11	recent 19:5,5,6 51:12	209:11 218:23	relation 128:3 129:24
			63:6 64:25 67:7	reformatted 44:15	131:5,10 135:6,23
212:5 217:14		161-14 177-15			
212:5 217:14	138:18,25 139:17	161:14 177:15			139:1 141:18 145:5
212:5 217:14 218:21 219:1	138:18,25 139:17 140:21,21 141:6	Ratle 117:20 218:8	90:14 103:4 145:4	refuting 120:10	139:1 141:18 145:5 151:23 152:5
212:5 217:14 218:21 219:1 purposes 23:19 24:4	138:18,25 139:17 140:21,21 141:6 149:22,24 151:18	Ratle 117:20 218:8 Raymond 6:1	90:14 103:4 145:4 recently 65:22,23	refuting 120:10 regard 5:10 6:8 10:6	151:23 152:5
212:5 217:14 218:21 219:1 purposes 23:19 24:4 39:10 73:7 126:10	138:18,25 139:17 140:21,21 141:6 149:22,24 151:18 167:18 170:15,16	Ratle 117:20 218:8 Raymond 6:1 reach 8:8 18:4 20:4	90:14 103:4 145:4 recently 65:22,23 97:20 148:3	refuting 120:10 regard 5:10 6:8 10:6 109:13,17,18	151:23 152:5 153:22 161:1
212:5 217:14 218:21 219:1 purposes 23:19 24:4	138:18,25 139:17 140:21,21 141:6 149:22,24 151:18	Ratle 117:20 218:8 Raymond 6:1	90:14 103:4 145:4 recently 65:22,23	refuting 120:10 regard 5:10 6:8 10:6	151:23 152:5
212:5 217:14 218:21 219:1 purposes 23:19 24:4 39:10 73:7 126:10	138:18,25 139:17 140:21,21 141:6 149:22,24 151:18 167:18 170:15,16	Ratle 117:20 218:8 Raymond 6:1 reach 8:8 18:4 20:4	90:14 103:4 145:4 recently 65:22,23 97:20 148:3	refuting 120:10 regard 5:10 6:8 10:6 109:13,17,18	151:23 152:5 153:22 161:1

Page 17
Trevor McGowan
Amended

217:21	89:16,19,25 90:21	147:1,3,18,24 148:6	132:7,8 137:1,18,22	136:16	riverside 62:2
relations 147:6 150:23	92:2 96:22 100:15	148:14,24 149:2,4	137:24 139:11,19	Rhine 215:20	river-specific 202:6
relationship 154:3	103:6	149:22 150:21	140:13 144:4	richness 47:24	RL 190:22
183:14 191:14	renewables 67:10	156:10 157:9,13,23	151:12,13 153:17	right 9:1,10,10,21,23	road 14:25
193:6,8 195:3 197:1	68:23 89:17 102:22	158:5,7,15 161:19	156:8,22 157:17,25	9:25 10:1,4,6,10,11	roadmap 2:6
197:2 208:1	106:9	161:22 162:2,14,18	160:12 164:9,12	10:13,15 26:2 32:13	roadmaps 1:17
relative 65:20 69:14	renvoi 10:12	162:18 163:23	170:13 172:19	45:19 64:23 67:22	rock 40:3
relatively 64:25	reopen 165:11 166:17	164:7,12,20 165:11	174:1,16 176:7	68:7 93:20,25	role 63:7 83:8 102:2,3
114:24 169:10	167:1	165:22 166:2,5	178:9,24 179:1,1	108:24 109:22	102:4,16 120:12,16
203:2 224:2	reopened 146:4,6	172:4,25 173:2	180:4 212:14	180:25 185:9	123:11 142:12
release 24:24 30:14,20	reorganising 88:22	174:1 177:6 180:8	respected 216:11	186:20 187:11,21	168:23 188:2 214:4
31:2 40:21 41:18	repair 35:24 47:19	reschedule 77:3	respective 131:25	189:12 191:20,20	223:14
42:12 47:14,25 54:4	repeat 181:15	reserve 78:16,16 84:1	132:2 134:12	195:9 196:19 206:12 222:20	roller 38:5
77:13 202:14 released 30:3,3,14,17	repeatedly 51:2 119:3 119:5 132:17	84:7,8,13 86:18,18 95:17 99:3,10	respond 6:18 86:14 113:2 116:2	224:6	roof 94:23 rooftop 96:19
30:25 53:4,12	136:14 153:10	100:25	responded 216:10	rights 151:3 208:12,13	room 82:23 84:9
161:24	replace 100:13 102:21	reserves 78:18 91:11	responding 2:19	208:14 210:11	rotating 82:9
releases 27:2 42:16	105:4	reservoir 12:16,20	response 3:14 115:24	217:20 222:4 223:3	rotating 82:5
releasing 24:20,23	replaced 70:6 103:23	14:19 25:10,17 26:5	138:4 188:21	right-hand 43:4 73:1	rotor 80:23
33:3 40:14	185:13	26:22,24 27:16	190:24 223:20,20	83:14	roughly 170:24
relevance 23:18,22,23	replacement 23:11	28:12,20 30:10,12	responses 116:12	riparian 186:17	round 6:17 18:18
24:3 112:18 122:21	replan 58:21	30:15,24 31:5,16,25	rest 114:10 121:6	RIPPIN 2:13	25:12
123:4 166:4	replicated 218:10	32:1 34:11,12,15,19	145:15	risk 54:16 55:25 56:24	roundly 177:20
relevant 25:4 47:22	report 78:4 196:6	34:21 38:24 39:5,8	restart 40:12	61:22 62:4 117:2	route 13:16
63:10 124:15 125:7	reporting 183:17	39:22 40:2,4,7,9,12	restoration 14:5	215:16	routing 13:23 25:8
140:7 143:21	208:2 210:4	41:5,17 42:7 43:14	restraints 216:17	risks 56:25 61:23	28:25
144:11 148:4 151:6	reports 90:15	45:14 47:7 80:11	restrict 207:15	137:15	rows 79:2
172:9 175:20	repose 36:17,17	93:9,10 129:3	restricted 130:25	river 16:22 19:9,23	rule 8:18,25 9:9 38:15
185:19,23 197:14	represent 72:21	152:14,21,22	176:2 178:22 198:2	24:1 26:21 28:12,20	39:6,14 147:5
204:10,15	REPRESENTED	198:18,25 199:4,13	restrictions 186:3	30:17,20 31:8,11,12	183:13 187:25
reliability 76:5,7	2:16	201:2,8 202:13	201:25 218:13	31:12,20,21,21,22	189:5 193:9,14,16
90:23	reproduced 78:3 87:4	reservoirs 12:19,25	restrictive 193:22	34:22 36:25 38:12	194:8,13,21,25
reliably 74:15	REPUBLIC 1:16,18	15:14,22 18:14	194:11	38:17,21 40:15 41:5	196:4 202:1,17,22
reliance 128:16	2:2,16	20:13 22:5,14 25:4	restrictively 194:9	41:21 47:23 52:11	217:5 218:17,19
130:22 133:1 177:3	repugnant 187:3	25:12,19 26:15,16	218:19	54:23 56:15 58:6,11	rules 160:13 166:17
relied 124:24	request 132:14 153:11	42:10,13 43:8,11	restricts 197:10	58:14,18,19 61:6,16	167:14 196:12
relies 128:10 207:25	153:13,16 154:12	54:15 91:14 152:12	result 54:17 162:6	70:10 81:10 88:1	rule-exception 195:3
relieve 219:25	155:1,8,9 159:23	206:4 216:8,19	164:24 165:7 166:7	129:24 161:24	197:1 208:1
relitigating 169:18,23	190:21 208:23	resistant 216:16	183:3	165:9 166:8,9 185:1	ruling 131:8
relitigation 171:23	requested 151:25	resolution 119:12,15	resume 62:12 171:1	185:4 204:5 206:12	rulings 119:3 153:2
rely 120:18 125:17	154:19 175:18	126:16,20,21 127:1	224:3	210:13 215:4	156:22,23
176:22 194:11	209:7 210:10	127:9 135:9 137:14	retained 26:5	riverbed 31:1 53:13	run 18:9,13,25 30:1
204:9 216:1	214:22	142:18,25 176:11	retroactive 162:16,21	53:18	36:5,7 37:15 99:20
remain 29:21 30:6	require 47:9,11 64:3	211:14	retrospective 157:15	rivers 3:23 2:24 8:14	114:21 129:24
42:14 89:2 147:9	83:12 90:21,25	resolve 124:11,17	175:17	9:2,22 31:8 37:2	running 22:24 52:23
remainder 139:18 remaining 19:7	103:25 147:7 203:6	134:21 135:5 142:5	retrospectively 158:2 159:9	38:21 58:20 120:15	60:8 99:11 201:5
198:24	203:19,21 212:9 required 69:2 84:20	142:23 144:9,13 149:15 191:4	return 2:16 5:16 7:12	123:10,21 124:7	runs 207:12 run-of-river 3:3,9,23
remains 120:3,6	86:17 88:3 105:4	resolved 174:18	8:11 11:16 62:11	126:4 128:2,25 129:6,25 130:7	, ,
remarks 7:17 90:5	155:24 158:16	180:17 211:9	160:7 164:17	131:19 138:3	2:14,24 3:22 5:1,6 8:14 12:12,23 13:3
105:6 116:13	199:21 211:2	resolves 142:17	165:19 204:5	151:14,21 152:15	13:5,7,13 42:21
139:24	213:11 214:12	resolving 149:17	219:17	153:3,8 154:22	55:9 56:9 62:20,25
remedial 20:1 51:1	215:6 216:3	173:22 175:4	returned 204:13	155:13 156:24	63:3,21 79:25 84:3
remember 27:3 29:23	requirement 33:23	resorting 75:7	returns 91:22	157:2 158:3 161:6,7	87:24 88:15 91:15
31:22 34:13 54:24	73:18 84:18 95:5	resource 17:10 101:1	review 44:10 119:18	166:19 178:2,5,11	93:10 95:21,22,24
59:20 93:15	215:8 218:4 221:19	resources 2:4 5:11	reviewed 113:16	182:21,24 183:3,9	96:5,7 98:7 99:14
remit 75:10 191:11	requirements 81:23	63:7,8 70:25 72:7	165:7	183:24 184:13	99:17 100:1,6,9
remote 71:6,10	141:11 183:17	79:4,18 90:18,21	revised 201:10	185:13,22,25 186:2	102:1,9 105:3 128:2
Removal 13:24	192:20 198:9 208:2	91:7 97:5 106:25	revising 39:14	186:6,20,21,23	129:5 152:15 153:7
remove 13:17 40:10	208:7 210:5 211:25	185:1 215:19	revision 219:8	189:13 190:4,13,19	154:17 158:2 159:2
removed 75:9 204:12	216:24 221:15,21	respect 9:25 24:15	revisit 3:18	195:11,12,21	182:21,24 192:8
render 126:17 173:25	requires 29:15 96:12	59:23,25 63:22	revisiting 11:11	196:15 197:12	196:21,24 197:16
rendered 118:19	138:7,11 207:14	71:12 99:3 110:11	revisit/reconsider	200:18 203:24	197:24,25 198:3
140:10 143:16	218:24	116:25 117:3,16	165:20	204:3 205:1,9	199:20 201:10,20
144:2 152:6	res 126:23 142:6,13	119:1 120:13 123:1	revolutions 64:15	207:18 208:24	207:5,9 220:11
rendering 157:22	143:2,6,22 144:17	124:13,23 126:1	re-examine 182:12	209:4 210:17	
renewable 5:10 64:1	144:19,25 145:3,18	127:13,25 128:9,23	re-litigation 143:4	217:10 218:1	S
65:25 67:7 70:22	145:20 146:8,16,19	129:12 130:17,23	RHEP 123:2 125:13	221:23	s 128:13

Page 18

Trevor McGowan

Amended

	T		ī	I	ı
sake 64:8 96:21	36:14	133:3 138:6 142:14	79:19,24 83:9,11,21	83:14 195:13	33:24 34:3,9 35:5
Salal 53:6,7	scouring 33:2	145:6 151:7 153:3	83:25 84:6 85:17	shows 13:15 24:9 25:5	47:16,17 58:19
sale 47:2	screen 138:6 163:22	154:11 159:11	94:10 100:16,21,24	64:14,22 66:17,24	104:25 209:16
salient 139:23	190:11 203:2 209:1	165:24 169:23	101:8 102:2,5,19	69:23 78:10 85:24	212:15 213:20
salmon 48:3	scripted 7:17	176:23 187:16,20	103:10 104:10,11	87:8,9 92:1,9 94:1	214:9 215:1
same 10:13 24:16	sea 19:4,10	193:12 197:7	session 5:12	96:22 122:7	sites 57:8 154:22
36:12,13 42:11 46:1	SEAN 1:10	202:21 203:1 204:4	set 49:23 82:11,13,16	shrink 170:10	155:16
61:5 66:8,25 75:17	season 28:6,11 29:2,4	205:15 221:7	82:20 84:18 139:5	shut 103:21 109:8	sits 198:23
76:15,19 90:23	29:8 30:4 38:18,19	224:14	148:16 154:15	shutdown 29:8 47:12	situated 90:4,7
93:17 101:22,24	39:8 84:5 87:2,2	seeing 101:16 107:18	163:4 166:18 175:9	shuts 95:16	situation 25:25 66:14
107:3 116:18 117:1	88:5,8 99:18,19,25	146:17	185:24 193:15	shying 177:18	78:24 137:25
117:3,21 129:17	100:3,12,19 102:20	seek 72:21	194:4 195:22 196:9	side 56:7 64:24 65:6	148:18 163:11
130:5 137:8 138:11	201:2	seemed 112:17	196:16 197:6	68:10 73:1,1 79:2	165:13 171:24
142:20 143:4,5	seasonal 91:14 104:4	seems 23:22 49:22	206:20 210:20	83:14,16 94:16	172:3 179:24 180:4
149:18 159:25	108:20	53:10 112:14 114:1	211:25 217:7	183:7 187:17	situations 169:3
171:23 174:7	seasonally 84:4 102:6	143:21 164:11	sets 82:2 202:1 206:3	190:11	six 88:11 161:2 210:1
189:15,16 201:10	102:18	169:20 221:12	setting 11:20 161:23	sides 40:7	size 31:12 58:12 70:18
204:5	seasons 87:13,13	seen 15:25 28:1 30:19	205:8	sight 11:3,6 224:12	122:5 212:12
sanction 147:3	SEBASTIAN 2:20	35:14 38:21 45:13	settle 131:9	signed 141:13,15	sketched 106:9
sand 18:3,3,7 30:25	second 4:9 18:5,6 30:2	53:13 66:15 82:3	settled 7:8 129:2	significance 145:6	skilled 135:2
35:19 36:16 38:2,3	41:12 52:14 61:20	117:8 136:14	147:5 180:17	168:3,11 182:13	skill-set 134:15
38:24 46:3	81:12 106:8 118:15	149:11 155:7	settlement 2:22	significant 15:18,20	skin 8:13 50:14
sanitation 203:3	119:9 120:18 125:7	175:17 177:20	149:12	30:21 35:21 60:4	slice 89:5,6,7
Sanmenxia 30:19	126:13 139:20	213:23	settles 30:17,18	64:3 65:12,24 87:8	slides 56:1 67:6
satisfaction 219:20	152:5,25 153:25	segment 58:18	settling 116:24	87:9,12 117:15	127:15
satisfy 71:25	154:8 162:13	seised 142:19	seven 134:19 165:18	118:20 162:24	slightly 115:3 128:9
Saturday 224:10	178:23 183:14	seismic 15:16 16:8	178:8	187:24 203:6,6	slope 20:17 21:11,15
Sauerman 45:22	184:5 195:7 204:1	20:23 213:16	seven-day 112:18	215:17,21 217:9	47:23 109:3,4
save 174:2 180:4	204:19 216:4	select 58:12 63:19	seven-member 136:2	significantly 64:19	slopes 21:12,17
197:10	217:17 220:9,13	86:13	seven-page 135:22	94:20 162:5	slowly 65:20
saw 1:10 34:13 158:18	221:21	selected 76:7	several 37:11 60:17	silt 16:16	slug 24:23 30:9
158:21 162:16	secondary 31:2 78:12	selecting 72:10	69:11	silty 43:8	sluice 34:6 39:10 56:8
166:19 176:20	secondly 139:3 151:19	selection 47:15 73:8	severe 16:1 17:10	similar 49:10 50:2	sluicing 25:14 27:15
saying 2:4 7:4 48:21	162:21	selectively 103:10	severely 55:8 205:21	64:22 70:18 94:24	28:1 29:1,14,21
51:16 107:15	seconds 95:12	self-denying 3:25	SHAH 2:4	98:2 102:17 166:22	31:7,17,25 32:12,15
144:25 145:9	second-round 170:17	170:19 224:8	shaking 21:18	167:2,9	32:16,23,24 33:3,8
146:11,20 148:1	Secretariat 11:22 12:3	self-propagating	shape 109:10 111:10	similarly 65:15 82:14	33:13,15 35:14,22
165:21,24 170:14	Secretary 2:7,8,19	21:19	shared 98:12 215:19	177:8	36:2,23 38:13 39:7
175:10 177:9,21	section 48:9 62:3	self-standing 10:4	sharing 208:20	simple 139:8 141:12	43:25 44:13,15,21
211:11 214:12	63:25 92:4 135:22	194:25 196:10	sharp 114:23,25	simplification 75:6	44:21 46:22 47:10
says 9:22 32:14 33:10	135:22	seminal 146:22,25	shelf 111:13 148:3	simplified 82:8 88:22	50:15 51:10 216:10
44:15 46:17 143:3	sections 193:8	semi-detached 10:16	shift 98:4 101:17	simplifies 75:4	small 8:5 16:19 19:15
	sector 90:14				
143:18 164:14		Senior 2:21	187:22	simplify 72:25 88:20	26:22 31:19,21,24
171:25 186:16	secure 7:13 186:22	sense 62:1 78:9 85:10	short 34:10 40:22	178:17	34:5,11,18,23 36:24
189:17 195:21	219:10	113:1 114:9 134:14	62:16 77:7 123:6	simplistic 71:22 81:18	36:24,25 45:4 55:9
197:18 206:21	sedimentation 26:7	147:23,24 163:7	150:18 171:4	simply 4:23 6:11	70:5,16 85:6 86:22
223:8	34:24	168:20 177:16	176:16,19	80:10 81:5,14	94:22 99:6 109:7
scale 39:2 46:19 65:2	sediments 13:16,23,24	senses 108:7	shortcuts 86:24	101:15 133:15	169:10 206:5
scar 16:5	33:2,4 40:10 43:8	sensitivity 47:22 48:6	shortened 115:3	142:24 145:15	smaller 16:21 26:15
scars 16:4	53:17	94:1 215:3	shortening 111:13	165:17 195:20	31:25 39:16 57:15
scenarios 52:8	sediment-guided	sensor 82:8	shorter 77:3 115:5,8	simulated 59:16	57:19 68:24 109:6
schedule 86:16 87:18	29:22 37:21	sent 7:3	shorthand 117:17	simulations 32:20	167:18 201:13
scheduled 77:1 85:18	sediment-laden 26:12	separate 156:14	shortly 3:23 120:16	simultaneously	Smelter 146:25
86:19	see 1:3,5 13:6 14:5,9	171:11 193:4	127:8 142:8 160:7	116:17	147:11,12
scheduling 86:21	14:16 16:24 26:2,25	205:19	short-term 91:17	since 22:3 45:15 49:9	smelting 203:7
schematically 41:4	29:1 37:22 39:20	separately 189:16	95:13 96:16 97:25	119:1 149:25 194:7	social 45:6,7 48:6
scheme 53:2 204:22	43:6 45:18 49:2	September 127:21	shoulders 7:22	206:25	socioeconomic 47:20
204:25 221:6	51:2 59:24 60:1,10	186:13 187:7,12	show 69:20 76:11	single 8:7 70:4 87:3	Société 147:18
	,	sequence 221:13		8	
223:18 SCHOFIELD 2:10	64:10,23 65:25 67:6	_	77:20,22 79:2 86:8	104:15 134:24	soil 14:7 40:3
SCHOFIELD 2:19	70:18 71:13 79:5	sequential 116:22	91:25 103:5 122:4	Sir 2:9 3:2 1:5,7,8,14	solar 5:8 22:23 63:6
school 51:5	87:2 92:18 93:14	series 25:19 64:15	137:20 189:3	1:24 2:1 11:9,19	68:11,11,19 69:1,3
Schwebel 167:13	95:7 97:22 98:13	97:5 118:10 152:1	212:19 213:25	62:13 106:3 112:6	69:6,10 72:8 79:8,9
scope 125:2,16 148:6	103:19 105:8	160:9 202:5	showed 50:19 200:6	113:24 114:7 115:2	79:18 84:21,22
152:25 153:17	108:17 111:16,17	serve 70:4 129:23	217:15 220:6	115:9 155:17 170:2	89:20,24 90:4,5,7
178:18 181:11,23	112:17,24 115:7,10	serves 136:25	showing 88:23 93:18	170:3 171:2 193:19	90:11,12,15,17,19
184:24 214:4,10,17	115:15 118:23	service 42:10,14 44:8	189:9	193:19 194:12	90:24 92:5,6,7,9,20
222:13	126:5 128:8 129:15	services 63:22 78:6,11	shown 64:22 65:11	196:3 224:1,5,15	92:22 93:2 94:12,17
scour 21:14 33:4	129:17 132:11	78:12 79:7,12,15,17	67:10,21 69:20	site 3:20 5:5,9 32:6	94:19,22 95:2,4
		,-=,,-,	,	,	, , .
I					

	sounds 22:15 133:11 source 23:6 67:16 79:23 89:18 92:13	spoke 188:2 215:21 spot 59:2	131:10 147:15 statute 149:8,14,19	141:4 143:4 174:11 183:24 189:22	supposed 211:6 Surcharge 198:7
100:7,22 101:7,22		-			
102:17 103:24,25		spread 27:23	168:2	193:16 196:10	199:16
	92:25	spring 191:2	steam 79:14 93:21	197:18 206:19	sure 12:4 23:17 73:5
106:23 107:8 s	sources 64:2,2,23	square 16:6 18:20	steel 51:6	208:13,15 210:6	99:4 109:15 119:19
solar-hydro 98:18	65:20,25 68:20	squarely 174:23	steep 36:14,15,15	submerged 36:17	139:16 150:15
sole 218:15	89:16 91:25 92:2	Sri 20:24	109:7	submission 116:19	170:21 207:3
solution 21:1	95:4 96:22 97:17	stabilise 21:25	steeper 111:21	125:5 134:5 151:11	surface 16:7 36:4 37:8
solutions 57:8 213:19	103:6 212:21 221:6	stabilised 39:13	steer 220:2	171:17 177:19	38:13
solve 51:8	221:14 222:22	stability 19:21 40:2	stem 61:17,18	178:12,16 179:6	surplus 85:8 95:19
	South 27:20	150:23 151:2 162:3	step 7:17 60:22 61:7	submissions 3:13,23	96:3 98:5
	southern 69:23 94:23	163:2	72:14 73:7,7 74:22	1:15 2:5,10,12 3:7	surpluses 104:10 surrounding 40:3
some 3:18 6:6 7:20 s 11:11 13:15 21:15	so-called 203:4 205:5 212:21 213:22	stable 219:9 stack 77:21 89:4	Stephen 2:11 114:11 115:4	5:17 6:22 114:12,15 114:20 115:23	Survey 60:7
23:25 27:20 28:16	212:21 213:22	stage 58:19 183:19	stepped 155:4	153:22 163:16	survive 1:9
	space 21:6 199:18	186:19 211:3	stepping 210:3	170:18 173:2	suspended 26:18 27:6
	span 65:8	stair 61:7	steps 221:13	182:21 219:11	27:8 35:17 59:25
	span 65.6 spawning 47:25,25	stand 11:8	stick 189:20	submitted 149:9	sustainability 216:8
62:24 63:17,23	48:1	standard 218:9	still 21:2 23:5 27:24	153:17	sustained 41:21
	speak 11:25 40:5	standby 78:18 86:18	45:11 66:5 73:19	subparagraph 188:24	sustaining 50:4 219:2
69:3 71:4,19 73:15	62:23	standpoint 60:14,15	93:22 94:18 96:12	204:2	swings 94:20
79:15 80:2 83:11 s	speakers 112:7	stands 1:15 2:4	102:9,9 133:1 170:6	subparagraphs 173:8	switch 84:9
84:7,10,24 85:24 s	speaking 12:7 31:13	start 12:15 31:19	170:13 209:14	subsections 122:23	switches 84:13
86:24 87:9,16 88:8	90:4 133:8 217:17	78:19,22,24,24	216:24 222:10	subsequent 119:14	switching 52:6
	speaks 191:17	86:22 107:19 110:5	stop 1:11 17:21 39:21	142:2 153:11	switchyard 56:14,15
	special 45:7 102:12	183:22 209:14	stopped 176:16,19	158:20,23 163:13	Switzerland 216:9
97:14 98:4,10,18	198:13,25 199:7	224:11	storages 100:14 105:4	181:13	SYED 2:4
	specialis 168:21	started 20:10 22:16	store 19:14 95:23 96:4	subsequently 171:17	system 3:10 2:15 5:2
	specific 55:16 75:3	45:12 51:14 64:16	101:20 198:1 201:1	174:23	18:13 52:23 61:6
104:5 109:15	118:4 124:3,14	65:22	202:13 205:16	substance 129:8	62:21 63:1,4,14,16
111:12 112:23,24	128:1 130:16 131:2	starting 10:21 11:1 109:24 118:10	stored 91:12 198:17 201:5	178:14 substantial 52:9 56:24	63:18,20,23 64:3,6 66:2 67:21 68:2,6
113:1,2,16 114:15 114:21 116:9	135:6,24 137:4,22 144:7 152:2 157:25	144:22 185:16	storing 69:3 111:9	substantially 203:25	68:12,16,18,25
120:22 125:5 135:5	165:8,12,12 166:8	starts 31:14 38:17	straightforward 59:6	substantive 116:12	69:13,19,25 70:16
135:14 137:4	168:20 172:25	64:18 205:22	101:18	successful 14:4,20	70:21,23 71:1,14
138:20 139:24	173:1 176:3 181:19	state 44:5 90:16 96:20	strategies 13:8,15,18	53:2	72:17,22 73:22
144:21 146:23	182:8 202:8 221:15	97:6,20 215:11	25:6	successfully 13:2,8	74:19,22,23,24
150:5 158:8 159:3	221:19	218:14	strategy 25:2 26:8,8	suction 45:18	75:20 76:1 78:5,15
159:13 165:18 s	specifically 96:14	stated 73:11 128:4	26:15 27:15 28:7	sudden 52:24	78:17,23 81:23 82:1
179:19 181:3,3	112:16 135:22	129:10,21 176:22	47:16	sufficient 71:5 73:19	82:7,12,19 83:2,4
191:15 194:2	172:20 192:14	190:1 213:21	strayed 136:5	199:8 215:2	84:2,10,11 85:5,9
198:12 203:7	193:5	217:10	stream 44:16 88:16	sufficiently 119:19	85:11,12,14,17,20
	specifications 192:7	statement 4:4 116:20	205:25	214:13	86:1,12,14,20 87:4
	specifics 63:15	116:21 133:24	stressed 170:8	suggested 5:2 193:24	87:15 89:25 91:1
	specified 191:15	134:1 141:13	strict 173:3 183:24	suited 98:23	93:13 94:8 96:12,23
	spectrum 49:13 50:18	143:19 145:8,9,15	188:13 189:4	SULJUK 2:6	97:1 98:3,4,8,9,22
	speed 80:20,22 81:1	188:8	192:10,11 195:13	sum 81:14 177:24	98:24 99:5,22
something 12:18 13:21 20:4,8 27:13	82:9,10,13,19 108:3 108:7,10,16	statements 127:22 182:5	196:15 205:8 strictly 172:1	summarise 102:25 127:16	100:10 101:2,4,6,11 102:10 103:24
	spend 19:20 125:5	states 14:15 44:1 60:7	strikes 23:20	summarised 73:23	104:14,18 105:5
46:8,12 51:4,7 59:3	138:18 178:14	78:5 93:20 98:15	strikingly 167:9	139:15 152:3 176:9	108:8 110:7 111:22
	spending 199:6	109:20 110:21	strong 190:24	summarising 138:24	112:11 150:24
	spent 159:13	167:11 215:8	struck 219:4	summer 39:9	211:19 215:4
	spike 52:25	state-of-the-art	structure 3:9,11 44:18	summit 11:3,3	systemic 3:14 2:18 6:7
	spikes 95:7,11	136:11 218:11	110:12	superficial 136:7	6:11,14 7:8,14,24
sometimes 8:5 83:6	spillway 18:7,8 36:10	station 72:23 74:16	structures 44:15	superficially 102:24	7:25 8:8 115:23
207:24 221:21	36:11,13 56:6,11	75:24 76:2,23 77:16	110:14	superseded 163:13	116:1 121:6 123:12
somewhat 102:11	178:2 212:8 222:2	84:10 99:11 104:17	structuring 73:17	supervise 211:7	123:13 124:10
	spillways 18:4 124:21	stationary 80:24	stuck 215:12	supplies 37:13	134:23 135:7
84:11 100:23	201:23	stations 60:8 69:15,25	studied 179:10	supply 52:13,22 53:23	157:10,22 173:18
	spin 80:20	71:20,25 72:12	studies 37:11 39:11	54:2 70:1 72:11	174:25 176:13
•	spinning 78:15 80:24	73:12,25 74:21	74:1,5	73:21 78:3 87:16	systems 63:3,5,24
sort 12:5 86:15 110:25	84:1,7,8,13 86:17	75:22 76:9 81:20	study 21:8 107:12	94:7 109:19 208:23	64:1 66:5 69:2 70:4
111:2 115:2 sorts 99:9	95:17 99:3,9 100:25	86:13 91:10 189:18	223:1 studying 22:16	209:7 supplying 88:6	70:6,7 78:1,7 80:15
	spins 81:1 spirit 208:4 217:19	stator 80:23 status 120:25 121:3	studying 22:16 stuff 30:22 114:21	supplying 88:6 support 99:2 110:5	82:18 84:21,23 89:23 96:15 103:18
sound 157:11 177:14	223:14	122:21 124:2,6	subject 9:4,12,24 10:1	support 99:2 110:3 supporting 37:16	107:19 109:6
	spirits 2:1	125:2,16 127:13	29:22 83:13 87:25	supporting 37.10 supports 64:3 70:22	107.17 107.0
213.12	- P-1100 2.1	120.2,10 127.13	27.22 03.13 07.23	5apports 07.5 /0.22	

Page 20
Trevor McGowan
Amended

T	technicians 11:23 12:3	48:3 49:12 54:6	170:14	178:14 179:19	travaux 9:16,19 186:8
tab 116:8 138:24	technique 150:14	56:14 68:20 70:8	thought 16:24 25:20	181:3,7,12 182:2	188:5 190:5 194:5
table 4:19 50:19 207:1	213:20	87:18,24 98:16	49:22 106:1 113:25	186:4,19 187:17	travel 52:10
220:5	techniques 13:3 25:8 216:7	100:10 103:21 110:4 118:25	168:5 181:21 thoughts 143:23 168:6	199:6 212:15 timeliness 186:5	treat 218:19 treated 145:3
tabs 116:6	technological 93:6	168:15 172:13	thousands 15:4,4	timely 210:16	treaties 8:2 135:3
tacit 142:11,13	212:12 213:22	178:25 179:3	84:12	times 16:6 86:4 110:15	167:23 222:10
tacitly 142:9 tailored 199:2	technologies 72:11	207:19 213:18	threads 3:14 4:15	111:9 203:14	Treaty's 135:19 136:7
tailwater 61:8 80:12	technology 65:13 93:6	218:14	10:21	time-consuming 44:11	155:15 176:11
Taiwan 16:1 27:21	203:21 212:15	theme 207:12	three 2:12 16:20 22:5	time-of-use 110:12	203:16 216:12
take 3:5 20:7 38:18	213:19	themselves 145:19	29:12 39:2 52:23	timing 87:18 224:11	221:15
39:18 42:8 62:10,12	tedious 8:5 Teesta 54:23 58:6	174:9 therefrom 204:6	53:1,21 54:3 65:8 104:25 120:7	Tinguiririca 25:21 today 1:17 2:7,13 4:8	trend 57:19 63:6 trends 92:17 103:4
77:1 86:1,3 89:9	tell 1:6 113:11	thermal 65:22 67:3,25	threshold 151:17	12:14 13:1,4 51:15	Trevor 1:23
96:3 110:1 114:13	telling 126:10	68:2,7 79:13 81:21	163:4,10 164:21	62:23 63:2 66:18	tribes 45:8
114:16 116:8 119:16 126:6	tells 96:9	93:16,18,20 94:5,13	through 4:4,23 11:25	73:7 82:18 91:20	tribunal 147:4
127:15 135:13	temperatures 11:4	103:17 106:25	12:7,7 13:24 15:16	96:25 112:7,8 116:1	tribunals 150:19
136:11 139:5,6,14	temporarily 1:22	thin 11:4	17:23 18:12,14,14	120:6 127:10	tributaries 61:18
146:11 156:13	temporary 19:14	thing 22:22 23:7 24:10	20:17,20 25:13 28:5	together 3:14 4:15	70:10 202:10
158:15 170:2,23	188:18 195:14 ten 20:7 45:3 205:7	35:25 43:3 44:3 45:16 58:17 67:6	31:18 32:1 42:4,5 42:20 44:5,17 46:14	10:22 20:8 185:10 192:3 193:3 196:13	tributary 61:19 219:21
182:17 203:19,20	tend 57:25 87:20 93:7	76:19 77:24 95:1	53:6 55:22 56:10	192:3 193:3 196:13 222:18	tried 191:4 214:16
215:8 217:4 219:12	110:14 111:25	97:3 100:23 109:23	63:11 64:15 70:8	told 76:18	tries 217:13
221:7 taken 7:6 92:1 113:22	tended 15:24	109:24 110:25	72:10 73:4 79:21	tomorrow 2:10 3:15	true 87:17 147:6,9
127:16 130:11	tends 26:14 27:9	111:2	80:17 87:23 88:8,9	4:10,12,16 10:21	181:9 192:19
132:8 186:7 196:11	53:12 217:3,4	things 1:6 3:15 13:19	92:19 94:17 97:24	11:2 75:15 114:22	trust 211:19
207:21,22 210:22	tenor 134:5	14:25 17:7 24:18	108:8,11,15 110:17	221:25 224:4,12	try 18:13 58:13 89:3
211:24 212:3,18	ten-year 92:21 term 75:13 129:15	39:23 41:20,25 42:19 48:16 50:24	110:17,18,19 113:7 114:16 122:6	tonnes 18:2,6,19 37:4 39:4	trying 24:6 44:22 72:3 106:22 107:3,11
213:2 214:14	188:9 195:12	57:7 67:20 76:20	127:15 139:5,6,14	tool 167:5	111:1 113:2 186:22
takes 22:8 40:18 150:2 163:16 174:3 208:2	198:25	85:4 109:1 175:8	139:23 143:16	top 22:14 28:13,25	220:1
taking 24:1,22 37:19	terms 10:8 17:11 45:6	178:17 181:22	161:17 168:7 169:1	29:16 66:1 79:4	tunnel 25:10 26:10,11
42:13 46:22 86:4	61:11 72:7 74:11	think 1:21,25 2:1 5:8	180:22 183:15	86:11 170:24	27:1,3,9,13 34:7,10
101:16 124:23	75:1,12 76:14 82:8	8:21 9:5 17:9 24:9	186:7,8,10 190:6	topic 62:23 135:23	45:19 46:1 58:22,23
125:22 128:8	119:18 127:4 134:1	24:11 25:3 27:2,12	191:2 198:9 199:25	topics 63:12	tunnels 26:16,17 27:5
144:20 145:4	147:21 166:23 176:9 184:1 185:11	35:25 43:23 44:14 52:7 53:15 55:3	203:11 207:10,12 208:11 210:14	topography 25:25 total 38:2 46:13 64:11	turbidity 25:13 turbine 13:21,25
178:13 207:16	185:18 192:21	56:21 58:9 62:7,10	212:18 213:11,24	64:13 67:1 68:12,13	35:24 47:18 80:6,14
talk 17:4,4,5 22:3 42:3 44:25 91:18 98:17	195:25 196:7,18	62:18 80:6 83:6	218:2,6 219:8	70:17 74:23,24	80:17,25 82:3,9,13
101:7 107:6 109:13	197:15 205:9 224:9	89:13 106:3 108:22	throughout 29:7	76:11 190:19	82:25 83:15 84:16
132:6 175:8	224:11	111:22 112:12,23	35:16 143:8 146:20	touches 180:9	84:19 85:3 87:19
talked 112:9	territory 174:4	113:7,19 114:5,7,24	156:3 189:11	touching 13:19	93:23 95:8,9 107:6
talking 12:15 17:6	Tesla 66:5 test 223:7	114:25 115:20 116:6 122:6 133:18	208:20 Thursday 34:4 35:9	towards 52:6 57:19 106:9	108:1,5,12 124:21 213:9
19:20 24:3 46:10	test 223:7 text 120:4 122:5 125:6	134:5 138:23	tied 72:4 189:17	tracked 45:24	turbines 20:20 22:9
107:25 150:6 177:1	148:12 150:3 195:4	145:11,17 155:18	tight 186:3	tracks 94:17	23:9 29:6 37:20
192:21 221:24 tall 34:9,25 43:14	196:5	158:9 161:13 164:3	tightly 9:4 10:3 183:7	traditional 77:19 91:7	38:3 39:21 40:13,19
tanks 82:4	texts 4:13	164:13 165:9,12	time 3:24 15:24 19:21	Trail 146:25 147:11	46:14 93:19 199:9
TANWEER 2:7	thank 1:8 11:7,9 12:9	166:3,6,15 167:4,7	19:22 20:9,20,25	147:12	212:8
Tanzi 2:11 150:2,12	23:15 35:11 51:24	168:10,12,19,20	21:1,24 24:16 27:23 32:19 37:15 40:18	training 37:18 transboundary	turn 22:11 23:9 30:1
171:14	54:7 56:21 57:10 59:5,7,9 60:19 62:6	169:11 170:1,8 171:6 177:5 180:10	40:18,22 42:11	215:18	40:16 65:6 98:22 110:24 138:4
TARAR 2:6	62:8,13,14 105:7,13	182:16 192:25	43:17 58:25 59:18	transcript 1:23 223:1	151:15 188:4 195:2
Tarbela 17:15,20,25	106:5 107:21,23	209:13 219:19	62:10 67:9 75:17	transfer 95:19 99:13	197:2 199:12
18:1,15 20:4,10,10 21:7 22:6,9,14,15	108:17 112:5	220:10,14,17	77:4,14,17 79:16	99:17,23 101:22	205:12 217:3 224:1
22:16,19 23:3,4,8,9	113:18,20 115:9,19	222:11 223:23	81:13,14 83:5 84:8	102:4	turning 24:18,19
23:11 24:8 36:15	115:22 131:21,22	224:1,5	86:3,5,10 88:24	transformation 64:11	74:10 125:10
40:20 42:12,14	132:10 146:10	thinking 21:5 48:12	90:23 92:17 93:3	91:5,12	156:12 172:6
tariff 72:18 73:6	150:17 163:20 167:12,17 170:3	51:3 143:22 third 8:15 53:3 69:13	107:3 108:25 109:18 110:4 111:5	transformer 80:15 transition 64:14 71:3	turns 24:11 108:10 Twenty 2:9,10
TARIQ 2:12	171:2,8 179:6	120:23 146:5	111:10,14,15	73:15 101:25	twice 37:7 38:12
task 10:23 116:1	180:13 182:15,22	183:16 189:6	113:25 114:2,4	transmission 70:8	two 15:9 18:4,14
149:16,18 182:17 team 40:24 41:1	207:3,7 219:16	195:17 196:6 203:4	115:1 116:10 117:1	80:8 90:20,22 94:9	20:13 21:12 24:18
technical 2:13,14 72:1	220:2,4,21,22	222:4 223:3	117:21 125:6	transport 19:24 35:17	25:18 27:22 29:11
97:8 124:11,18	222:25 223:22,24	though 15:13 50:3	133:22 137:8	36:6	30:24 35:3 39:10,23
135:6,17,24 137:5	224:5,15 their 4:23 11:14 17:10	75:16 88:1 89:23	138:19 157:18	transported 47:24	42:19 45:17 52:25
161:12 173:7,12,16	their 4:23 11:14 17:19 19:6 21:10 25:25	94:18 118:15 130:2 132:20 133:3,11,23	159:13 164:5,9 170:8,9 171:1	transpose 192:6 traps 16:13	53:23 54:2 67:20 74:13 79:10 89:2,10
175:6 182:8 211:25	17.0 21.10 23.23	152.20 155.5,11,25	170.0,7171.1	ы ар э 10.13	77.13 77.10 07.2,10
	l	L			

Page 21
Trevor McGowan
Amended

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Day 3 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase Wednesday, 10 July 2024

	1				
107:24 117:2	216:3 220:19	211:17	utile 194:17	200:3	80:5,10,12,17 81:24
118:23 121:23	underground 56:19	unshakable 147:15	utilisation 217:15	views 59:6 128:12	82:17 84:17 99:19
122:12 138:12,24	underlying 66:7 73:18	unsurprisingly 163:1	utilised 70:25	VII 208:24	108:4 112:10
145:13 151:17	73:25 145:19,24	until 1:22 115:12	utilities 104:2 110:13	VIII 209:18	152:11 154:20
		116:7 224:17			
157:8 167:18	146:13 148:21,25	110:/ 224:1/	utility 70:5 72:19	VII(2) 209:1	184:13,17 185:1
168:19 170:25	155:10 202:18	unusual 14:9 44:24	73:16 75:18 79:18	VILMANTE 2:21	189:3 190:3 195:14
171:9 191:15,22	215:5	184:15	97:17 99:21 110:8	violation 218:16	196:14 198:1,17,24
196:12,13 197:13	undermined 142:23	unusually 4:20,21	110:23	vires 174:11	199:4 200:17,17
200:1 203:2 213:23	146:9	upheavals 94:2	utility-scale 90:8	virtue 141:10	201:1,5,5 203:10,17
223:1	underneath 89:1	uplifting 2:1	96:18	visible 45:21	203:20,21,24 204:2
two-year 31:14	underpin 144:12	upper 86:7 87:20	utilization 151:3	visit 3:20 5:10 82:4,22	204:5,12 205:1,5,10
type 33:20 47:18 55:5	183:18 184:1	199:13		106:1	205:16
56:5 190:13	underpinned 219:10	uprise 93:25	V	visiting 105:16	watercourse 204:12
types 25:1 32:21 37:11	underpinning 161:14	upstream 17:17,18	v 145:4	visits 19:1 223:16	watercourses 161:2
50:2 57:7 58:23	189:10	18:14 20:13 23:21	valid 128:7	visualise 16:2	waterpower 64:12
61:23 138:9,10,12	underpinnings 3:10	23:25 26:23 28:17	valley 16:10 57:12	vis-à-vis 125:10	waters 1:2 2:4 7:3,12
178:19	8:7	34:23 35:6 36:4	valuable 79:6,23	vitally 151:2	9:1,21,24 50:7
typhoons 27:21	underpins 182:25	42:13,15,18 45:20	101:1	VI(2) 208:22	66:10 67:13 69:15
typical 77:8 78:6	underscore 9:17	45:22 55:13 59:22	value 23:20,25 79:24	voltage 66:6 78:13	75:3 102:12 118:25
83:15 85:21 87:13	understand 4:20,21	61:9,20 62:4 80:11	92:10 93:1,14 94:5	volume 30:5 77:2,2	127:4,17 149:16
93:1 95:8 96:20,25	16:17 17:8 20:18	162:5	101:2 102:10,10	85:7 101:18,20	150:25 161:6
typically 28:7 36:14	23:18 36:1,18 50:10	usable 185:3	123:4 124:2,6	114:16 185:19	168:22 183:3,4,5,9
40:23 41:8 44:4	55:11 56:25 68:16	usage 65:22 102:11	125:12 126:9	188:11,17,23 198:1	183:23 184:7,10,19
47:2 58:18 59:1	82:5 87:10 145:1	199:2	130:15 132:17,22	198:2	185:12,19,22,24
67:25 72:20 75:25	165:24 192:15	use 8:25 9:1,10,21,23	132:23 134:12	vulnerable 186:18	186:2 188:9,20
83:17 87:22 88:11	206:22	10:10 20:3,14 22:15	136:20 177:23		189:8,9,13,15
101:15	understanding 15:16	25:16,25 32:6 36:22	values 92:15	W	195:11,12,20,22
t)he 130:24	23:20 51:13 107:25	38:20 45:17 63:21	value-neutral 200:5	WAHEED 2:6	196:19 197:10
	109:15 133:17,23	65:7 68:4 69:4 75:1	variabilities 109:16	Waldock 8:22 193:19	202:14 203:12
U	133:25 199:22	77:4 96:15 97:18	variability 60:10	Waldock's 196:3	205:25 208:9 209:3
ultimate 110:23	understood 186:4	100:8 101:8,24	86:10 91:4 95:1	walked 168:7	209:8 217:15,22
ultimately 72:17 74:8	undertake 207:23	105:2 109:1 111:1,5	97:25 98:10 106:14	walking 18:1	218:6
88:16 110:18	undertaken 215:15	112:1 154:16 161:5	108:19,20,20	wall 201:3,8	watershed 14:2,4,12
180:23	underwater 21:19	161:7 183:2,23	variable 84:22 98:22	want 13:10 15:3 16:17	14:19,21 15:3,6
ultra 174:11	unfavourable 126:15	184:2,10,19 185:4,9	103:6 104:15 107:4	20:3 29:25 30:14	26:23 60:2 61:21
unambiguous 129:22	unfettered 9:21	185:12,25 186:23	107:4	32:17,25 34:3 37:1	71:6 96:8
unanimously 136:3,17	unfold 1:6	187:11,24 189:8,9	variation 86:15 87:16	55:24 59:1,4 61:14	watersheds 48:25
uncertain 49:17	unforeseen 129:4	189:12,14 190:13	88:9 108:3	83:17 88:19 99:6	49:4,4,5,24 71:11
uncertainty 106:13	152:12 198:21	190:14 192:1	variations 85:2 199:10	102:13 103:1	way 9:5 12:21 20:2,3
unchallenged 147:10	203:22	193:13 195:9,20,22	varies 81:4 94:19	109:14 110:21	22:13 33:16,17,18
147:16	unfortunately 49:18	196:14,19 197:10	variety 24:7 97:8	113:20 114:22,24	37:25 49:8,23,25
unclear 113:15	56:14 111:19	202:12,25 203:5,9	175:5 210:8	133:24 169:12	50:23,24,24 51:9,18
uncontrollable 162:24	135:12	203:18,23 204:3,4,8	various 10:22 78:11	170:15,21 186:9	52:8 55:18 61:4
199:17	ungated 56:6	204:10,17 205:1,5,7	91:2 116:25 222:22	193:18 194:3	69:3 73:11 76:15
under 6:9 37:23 40:23	uniform 110:17	207:17 211:17	vary 83:24 84:4,16	198:11 212:24	91:15 92:10 101:23
54:12 66:3 75:10	unilateral 219:7	212:10,11 214:16	87:24 93:8	213:24 219:17	101:24 106:23,25
86:1,5 114:2 116:2	unique 4:19 25:24	217:21 221:18	varying 78:14	223:18	107:15 110:22
123:8,18 124:8,17	unit 108:15	222:2,7	vast 16:15	wanted 67:14 139:16	116:13 133:21
125:3,19 126:16,21	United 14:15 44:1	used 27:14 33:21	Vaughn 1:23	wants 18:17	135:8 146:2,16
127:1,9 128:17	60:7 78:5 93:20	42:19,19 63:4 64:11	vegetation 14:5,13	warning 1:10	150:5 170:6 174:7
134:3 135:7,9,16,18	98:15 109:20	75:5,13 85:18 91:20	vegetative 14:7 16:7	warranted 131:9	195:4 205:19
140:14 142:3,5,17	110:21 167:11	97:10,23 100:9	vehicle 45:24	Warsak 30:23 41:9	215:25 222:23
142:20,25 145:12	units 83:1	101:6 102:1,6	velocities 52:11	53:14	ways 12:17 35:3 50:10
146:6 149:16,19	unless 114:5 179:5	104:16,18 108:25	velocity 18:4,5 28:22	washing 203:3	50:13,14 100:18
150:24 151:18,20	192:5 224:2	183:9 199:1,5 201:3	Venezuela 216:10	wasn't 97:13 105:22	110:2 135:14
155:20,24 156:9	unlike 136:21 173:14	useful 78:6 104:8 191:23	verify 211:20	113:11 142:14	223:18
157:4,7 158:17	unlimited 61:5	user 70:5	versed 119:22	171:22 179:20	weakness 132:19
159:17 160:4 161:2	unmoved 155:7		version 188:12,23	181:6 182:2 191:16	weaponisation 52:2
161:11 162:2 163:2	unpack 10:19 unpackage 138:17	uses 26:13 65:15,17	versus 58:2,22	215:12 219:7 220:8	Webb 2:10 3:25 2:23
166:18 167:6		77:20 96:18 183:16	vertical 38:6 83:17	water 2:4 14:12 17:10	8:11,21 9:6 10:19
168:13 172:10,14	unrealistic 160:15 unreliable 96:7	186:19 190:20,22 203:2	Verulam 2:10,11	19:8,10 22:8 25:16	114:13 115:4
173:13,15 174:11	unreliable 96:7 unrestricted 8:25 9:1	using 23:22 42:21	veteran 4:24	28:8,13 29:4,5 30:5	170:21 182:17,22 191:20,24 192:19
174:18 176:10	9:10,23 10:10 183:2	47:19 67:19 88:1	viable 13:12 50:15	30:21 31:3,18 36:3	191:20,24 192:19
178:1 180:3 185:25	184:2,10,19 185:9	93:21 95:13 109:20	Vienna 135:16 193:24	36:3,7,9,11,19 38:6	206:13,15,17,24
187:5,8 188:1 191:4	186:20 187:11,24	201:4	194:6	39:9 40:4,5,11,14	207:4,8 219:16,24
197:4,23 200:22,25	189:8,12 192:1	usually 199:18	view 20:5 33:25 54:16	41:7 48:2,24 52:6	220:2,14,20 221:17
204:1,20 205:20 208:12 209:17,23	193:13 195:9	US-Canada 184:25	81:18 126:14,15	52:10,24 53:1,23	222:25 223:21,24
	173.13 173.7	UB-Canada 104.23	129:22 136:7 200:3	60:14 61:22 77:2,12	222.23 223.21,24

Webb's 114:20	196:15 197:12	WILLIAMS 2:20	45:13 60:6 64:9	1	158 3:20
Wednesday 1:6 1:1	200:17 203:24	willing 133:4	69:5,14 70:6 71:9	1 3:1,2 9:9 22:19 23:5	16 80:4 138:25 140:9
week 24:25 63:11	204:3,25 205:9	wind 5:8 63:7 68:19	89:19 92:15 94:4	24:18 32:19 39:10	141:3 149:3 199:20
103:20 112:20	210:17 217:10	79:8,9,18 89:20,24	98:3 103:8 187:9	115:25 139:20	163 3:21
133:22 134:8	218:1 221:22	90:6,11,13,24 92:6	191:5 219:6	143:16 173:8,8,8,24	17 81:20 151:22 200:2
150:16 171:15	Westinghouse 66:4	92:9,23 93:3 97:14	worrying 52:21	179:15 182:22	179 3:22
weekly 199:10	wet 28:6,11 29:4,8	98:11 100:23	worst 44:3	185:7 197:15,17	18 83:14 123:19 152:9
weeks 52:24 53:1	30:4 38:18 84:5	102:16 103:24,25	worth 24:22 185:6	1,000 58:2,3	154:13 200:13
weigh 8:3	88:5 99:17,19,25	windows 1:21	221:11	1,200 54:25 58:7	18th 64:16
weighing 7:19,22	102:20 we'll 1:24 25:2 34:3	winds 11:5 windy 97:13	wouldn't 21:21,21 58:14 185:20	1,400 22:7	18.35 201:9
weight 5:18,19,25 6:19,23	35:4 36:14 37:3	winter 37:23 38:21	WOUTER 1:12	1.02 115:11	1800 64:9 182 3:23,25
weighted 92:15	42:1 64:5 106:4	201:4	writing 141:12 165:16	1.5 18:22	189 141:22
welcome 113:9,10	109:13 126:5	wiped 56:15	167:14 209:25	10 1:6 1:1 28:22 69:20	19 85:21 152:24 178:6
143:23 150:10	129:15 136:20	wishes 23:24	214:13	138:7 186:13 187:7	198:19 200:20
welcomes 121:5	151:15 170:5 171:1	withdrawal 188:10	written 106:3 194:21	190:10 210:20	206:9
well 7:22 11:11,14	171:1,16 199:6	withdrawn 204:6	wrong 126:19 136:4	10,000 97:21	19th 65:3
17:8 33:16 48:21	220:23 221:24	witness 4:4	222:20	10-15 67:12 114:19	191 4:1
53:10 57:18 60:10	224:14	wonder 114:18 220:12	wrote 190:17	10.54 51:22 100 12:20 14:9 16:6	1939 147:19
66:14,15 67:5 70:11	we're 7:4 8:4 15:14	wondered 19:25		27:12 32:18 39:13	1941 147:2
71:12 84:25 90:3,7	18:11 19:11 20:19	wonderful 17:2	X	86:9,21,21	1950s 64:20
90:9 98:23 100:3	22:3,13 49:11 69:15	wondering 16:23 21:2	XI 135:20	100% 83:18 171:21	1957 186:13 187:7
101:9 111:16 113:9	71:10 72:3 74:19	21:5 60:22 114:3	XII 135:20	202:13	1959 187:12,15 188:7
113:22,23 115:6	76:14 86:20,21	132:5 143:12 168:2		100,000 18:20 41:8,20	190:10,17
119:22 133:6,18	92:22 95:23 100:8	168:10 179:12	Y	70:16	1960 1:2 191:2,7
154:4,7 164:13	101:7,15,16,23	221:4	year 18:19,24 24:24	100-year-old 22:25	203:18 212:13
166:3 168:12	102:4 106:22 107:8	word 17:11 20:3 69:19	27:23 29:7,12,25	105 3:12	215:12
170:23 174:20	107:11 109:20	101:5 149:14,15	37:4 45:17 46:5,9	108th 127:20	1961 184:25
179:24 181:21	111:9 114:2 115:20	wording 124:25 133:3	67:12 76:17 87:6,6	11 21:9 71:18 139:25	1962 45:12,15
182:3 191:17	143:21 164:4 170:1	144:19,22 145:7	87:14 88:2,5 99:24	172:15,16 193:6	1971 200:25
192:12,16 201:21 206:19 220:20	170:8 192:21 193:10	169:8 171:12 173:18 185:7	111:24 141:9	207:8 210:20	1975 20:11 1998 20:24
went 56:11 109:8	we've 11:22 16:12,12	197:21	years 12:20 13:15	11% 68:15	1990 20.24
162:4 177:19	20:16,23 27:7 35:14	words 12:1,8 13:18	17:20 20:7 21:9,9	11.11 62:15	
were 4:1 5:3 6:3 11:11	52:11,18 53:13	30:12 117:18 122:6	30:24 37:11 39:13	11.40 62:11	2 9:9 23:5 24:20 63:2
13:1,7 37:19 42:12	88:22 94:1 100:21	123:20 124:5	45:3 48:17 56:16	11.41 62:17 110th 128:20 129:18	115:1 116:11
45:9 56:23 59:18	105:15 114:20	143:13 150:20	58:20,20 59:17,20 60:8 65:5 74:7	115 3:13,16	139:21 152:17
65:5 82:5,6 83:1,1,4	136:14 150:6	153:21 164:2	87:10 90:12 94:2	116 149:5	183:12 196:9 197:8
87:6 88:25 91:12	167:21 172:7 175:7	184:15 191:14	103:6,22 165:18	117 149:21 162:1	2F.1 122:23
105:19,20 109:7	175:17 177:20	194:17 201:9	178:8 203:15 219:5	163:14 165:17	2F.2 122:23
112:7 113:1 114:9	185:24 198:18	work 14:22,22,23	year's 24:22 141:23	118 163:14	2% 21:11,17
123:17,20 130:11	204:16 218:7	21:25 26:9,13 50:16	year-round 39:15	119 162:1 165:17	2(a) 198:17
136:6,9 146:3	whatnot 86:19 98:1	51:1,1 55:18 56:13	104:3	12 3:3,5 21:9,9 71:21	2(b) 199:3
147:11 156:25	192:22 whichever 20:3 81:16	58:11 61:13 69:25	yellow 30:20 92:18,19	140:8 143:11 195:4	2 (g) 196:20 198:3
157:3,4 158:18 168:3 170:7,11	while 2:2 11:19 65:9	71:16 103:15 106:24 146:22	yesterday 1:11,16 2:5	197:4 210:21	2.00 114:4
177:15 182:7	72:22 93:12 117:1	187:3 192:9,11	4:8 9:15 10:18	12% 68:13	2.15 114:4 115:6,10,12
201:13 206:1 211:4	119:4 120:18	194:20 200:25	11:18 22:24 29:23	12.47 105:11	2.21 115:13 20 37:6 58:2 86:25
216:3 219:4 221:1	129:11 130:17	201:19,21 205:21	34:13 38:8 49:11	120 56:16	111:15 201:24
222:19	131:24 135:4 168:5	205:23,24 206:10	54:10 155:18	120% 86:11 123 141:22	20th 64:19 65:3,6 70:3
weren't 37:19 51:3,3	177:13 186:21	207:5 209:3,6,7	184:14 188:2 192:25 193:21	123 141.22 13 74:10 143:7 146:19	20-vear 28:22
west 37:13	191:3 197:25	210:25 211:4,4	198:14 217:15,24	174:5 180:11	200 18:19 34:8 37:13
western 3:23 2:24	218:16	219:25 220:15,19	yield 13:16,22 72:24	197:17 204:2	148:4
8:14 9:2,21 69:23	white 32:22	worked 13:14 14:18	,	13.14 171:15	2000 190:22
120:15 123:10,21	whole 16:20 18:11	23:2 25:19 27:7		130,000 41:11	2006 201:7
124:7 126:4 128:2	40:18 58:13 78:1	35:15 43:7 45:3	Zealand 216:9	131 3:17	2007 6:1 119:5 215:20
128:25 129:6,25 130:7 131:19 138:3	81:13 89:13 97:5 99:23 104:20 110:8	48:13 50:17,21 103:22	zero 53:24 99:18	14 78:2 147:17 178:5	2008 111:18
151:14,21 152:15	110:15 144:1 154:3	working 2:3 5:14 17:7	109:8	198:3,20	2010 215:14
153:2,8 154:22	156:5	18:12 20:6 51:5,14	ZOHAIR 2:6	14,000 22:10,11	2012 148:20,22 149:1
155:12 156:24	wicket 82:10,12 108:9	61:24 83:4	zone 26:12	143 3:18	2013 21:8 55:4 119:1,3 123:19 127:5,20
157:2 158:3 161:6	108:10	works 14:21 20:18,18		144 36:24 149 3:19	123:19 127:5,20 154:13
166:19 178:2,5,11	wide 31:18 34:11	38:14 90:1 107:19		149 3:19 15 3:6 59:17 80:2	2014 87:7 128:20
182:21,24 183:3,9	43:14	187:5 192:16 193:4	\$1.5 58:4	111:15 148:2	2015 87:7 111:18
183:24 184:13	wider 34:15,15	197:22,25 201:16	\$500 23:12,13	198:16 201:25	127:5 130:8,11,13
185:13,21 186:2,6	width 31:7 32:2 34:17	205:16 207:9,10,20		202:1,5,11	2015/16 111:18
186:19 190:4,13,19	34:19,20 43:5,12,13	210:10	0	15-minute 170:24	2016 7:2 130:12,21
195:11,12,20	Wildlife 44:8	world 38:10 39:3	0.2 69:17	150 18:2	131:13

Page 23
Trevor McGowan
Amended

Day 5 Hearing on the Wertes, 1 list 1 hase wednesday, 10 July 2024					
2023 67:16 116:4	35 25:15 53:15 173:20	523 159:4	98 32:18		
2023-01 1:3	183:21 211:21	528,000 46:4	99 32:18		
2024 1:6 1:1 20:11	35(a) 2:20 6:19	53 48:8	JJ J2.10		
96:21	35(b) 3:1 211:22 221:2	54 50:9			
206 4:2	1 /	57 69:10			
	35.48-metre-high				
21 88:18 111:16	201:8	57% 68:1,4			
153:15 190:17	36 25:21 174:22 214:4	59 148:7			
202:19	37 26:10 175:19				
219 4:3	218:17	6			
22 89:15 153:24 203:8	38 26:19 149:7 168:1	6 64:22 93:1,1,16			
22,500 39:3	175:24	116:3,4,16,17 117:6			
220-million-cubic-m	39 27:15 176:21	119:17,24 127:19			
201:2		137:10 183:21			
23 90:3 117:6 140:9,10	4	187:13 211:22			
140:24 141:8,10,11	4 31:1 64:5 122:4	60 58:20			
142:5 143:18 145:7					
145:12 154:12	184:11 185:6	60% 83:18			
	209:19	600 184:17			
171:12 173:8,13	4,000 25:23	61 148:12			
204:7	4.02 171:5	62 3:9,11			
236 201:12	4.110 177:8	660 39:5			
239 169:15	4.15 179:7				
24 77:1 91:24 117:11	4.22 182:20	7			
127:21 155:7 205:6	4.44 176:25	7 66:13 116:6 128:19			
24/7 37:15	4.9 92:22 93:16	172:15 173:20			
25 93:15 131:13	4.97 217:12	180:3 188:7 206:2			
153:15 156:19	40 17:20 18:5,6 29:20				
205:12	37:6 177:8	206:20 219:18			
26 94:15 158:22	40% 17:16 20:12	7(b) 219:22			
205:20	46:13	7(c) 206:14			
27 96:19 153:24 159:5		7,000 46:6			
206:1 220:6	40-50 59:20	70 18:3,6			
28 98:18 137:11	400 39:4	74 45:4 46:5			
	41 177:20	75 170:22			
160:11 207:8	42 35:25	75% 68:8			
29 101:5 160:22,25	43 36:22 37:4	77-metre-high 201:3			
167:21 168:11	43% 38:3				
169:6 207:12 223:6	44 37:3	8			
	443 211:11	8 2:11 4:11 7:15 10:24			
3	444 211:11				
3 1:6 2:10,11 3:1 1:13	45 23:10 39:1	66:24 114:21 116:6			
31:1 63:12 119:16	450 215:15	116:8 129:17			
154:23 183:22	452 160:17	138:24 189:6			
		196:23 199:22			
184:9 197:15	457 151:5	201:24 202:21			
3% 21:16	46 39:18	212:1 218:3			
3,000 58:13	466 153:4	8(a) 124:19			
3,500 25:24	469 175:19	8(c) 124:20 199:15			
3-kilometre 27:3	47 41:4	8(d) 212:20			
3.3 92:24 93:16	470 161:13 175:25	8(e) 124:20			
3.47 171:3	176:9 177:21				
3.5 27:2	48 42:3 43:4	8(f) 124:21 8(g) 200:15			
30 12:14 23:10,10	49 43:21	8(g) 200:15			
40:20 56:3 60:8	1	8.62 140:5			
90:15 102:23 161:8	5	8.69 140:5			
207:25		8.70 143:3			
30% 68:12,23	5 64:7 96:21 122:19	8.73 169:14 171:19			
30,000 90:17	186:12	80% 83:19 86:11			
*	5.1 135:22				
30-year 111:15	5.18 219:14	9			
30/20 58:14	5.26 224:16	9 46:8 67:14 112:16			
31 12:17 103:4 161:20	5.30 1:11 114:22,24	130:10 165:5			
163:22 193:23	170:22	189:21 209:23			
194:1,13 209:1	5.8 93:24 94:6				
316 174:14	50 12:20 22:10 41:1	9.30 224:14,17			
32 3:7 13:22 118:7	44:25	9.33 1:2			
139:17 172:6	504 190:1	9.34 1:12			
193:23 194:1	506 207:13	9.50 12:11			
209:16		900 46:7 69:17			
33 14:2 172:16 209:23	51 3:8 46:21	95 32:18			
34 25:7 118:8 155:9	52 47:15	96 32:18			
	522 175:2 200:8	97 32:18			
173:4 210:19	216:21				
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			

Page 24