PCA Case No. 2023-01

IN THE MATTER OF AN ARBITRATION

-before-

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

-between-

THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

-and-

THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

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

COURT OF ARBITRATION:

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

SECRETARIAT:

The Permanent Court of Arbitration

ON BEHALF OF THE COURT OF ARBITRATION:

Sean D. Marphy

Professor Sean D. Murphy Chairman

CERTIFIED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 19 OF ANNEXURE G

12 July 2024

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

Peace Palace The Hague The Netherlands

Day 5

Friday, 12 July 2024

Hearing of the First Phase on the Merits

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

BETWEEN:

THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN -and-THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

Transcript produced by Trevor McGowan Georgina Vaughn and Lisa Gulland

APPEARANCES

FOR THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

MR SYED MUHAMMAD MEHAR ALI SHAH, Commissioner for Indus Waters, Ministry of Water Resources MR ASAD KHAN BURKI, Legal Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs MR ZOHAIR WAHEED, Office of the Attorney General H.E. MR SULJUK MUSTANSAR TARAR, Ambassador of Pakistan to the Kingdom of The Netherlands MS FATIMA HAMDIA TANWEER, First Secretary, Embassy of Pakistan to the Kingdom of The Netherlands MR JAMAL NASIR, First Secretary, Embassy of Pakistan to the Kingdom of The Netherlands SIR DANIEL BETHLEHEM KC, Twenty Essex, London PROFESSOR PHILIPPA WEBB, Twenty Essex, London DR CAMERON MILES, 3 Verulam Buildings, London PROFESSOR ATTILA TANZI, 3 Verulam Buildings, London MR STEPHEN FIETTA KC, Fietta LLP, London MS LAURA REES-EVANS, Fietta LLP, London MR ABDULLAH TARIQ, Fietta LLP, London MS MEGAN RIPPIN, Fietta LLP, London DR GREGORY L MORRIS, Technical Advisor MR PETER J RAE, Technical Advisor

THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA WAS NOT REPRESENTED

FOR THE PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION

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

Submissions on the Calculation of Maximum2
Allowable Pondage
By Dr Miles2
Court questions
Questions from THE COURT
Response to the Court's pre-hearing
questions 1(a) and (b) and 2(b)

By Dr Miles143
Court questions
Questions from THE COURT
Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility168
of a Narrative Dispositif
By Professor Tanzi168
Questions from THE COURT
Observations on the Court's questions to
Professor Tanzi
By Sir Daniel Bethlehem
Questions from THE COURT
Concluding observations and request for relief206
By Sir Daniel Bethlehem
Questions from THE COURT
Discussion re procedural matters

1	Friday, 12 July 2024	09:36 1	diving a bit deeper into its text, and the text of the
2	(9.34 am)	2	provisions surrounding it, to determine the proper
3	THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. This is the fifth	3	approach to the calculation of maximum pondage for
4	day of our hearing on the first phase of the merits.	4	India's new run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers.
5	I see that Dr Miles is at the podium unless,	5	(Slide 5) Now, in order to do this, I propose to
6	Sir Daniel, there's any opening issues we need to	6	proceed in five parts, and I'll ask you to bear with me.
7	address?	7	As you can probably appreciate, there's a bit of
8	SIR DANIEL: I think I did my opening last night, so it's	8	complexity involved in the subject and, as Pakistan has
9	really up to Dr Miles.	9	throughout the week, we're going to be sort of building
10	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. In that case, Dr Miles, whenever	10	the pyramid before we reach the final summit.
11 12	you're ready, please proceed.	11	So with that in mind, first, I will briefly revisit
12	SIR DANIEL: Actually sorry, Mr Chairman my colleague reminds me: I think we put in an application to you in	12	the concept of pondage and explain its role in
13	writing this morning for one new document which we would	13	a run-of-river HEP generally, picking up on some of the
14	hope to use after lunch. It's an Indian document, so	14	concepts discussed by Dr Morris and Mr Rae earlier in
15	they have it, and it's responsive to one of your written	15 16	the hearing.
10	questions which Dr Miles will be addressing in his	10	Second, I will address you on the various provisions of the Treaty that are relevant to pondage in
17	submissions after lunch. So at some point if you could		an Annexure D.3 HEP and explain how, properly
18	give us your directions on that, that would be helpful.	18	
	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. We will consider the matter,	19 20	interpreted, they reflect a clear design philosophy on the part of the Treaty's drafters, and that design
20 21	hopefully over the coffee break, and let you know in due	20	· · · ·
21	course.	21	philosophy is to minimise the storage of water by India
	SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much.	22	as pondage on the Western Rivers.
23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles.	23	Third, with that philosophy in mind, I will explain
24 25	(9.35 am)	24 25	the correct approach to the calculation of maximum
23	(5.55 am)	23	allowable pondage under the Treaty; and more
	Page 1		Page 3
09:34 1	Submissions on the Calculation of Maximum Allowable Pondage	09:37 1	specifically, the approach to the question of how to
2	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court,	2	determine pondage required for firm power under
2 3	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than	2 3	determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume
2 3 4	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum	2 3 4	determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool.
2 3 4 5	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of	2 3 4 5	determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to
2 3 4 5 6	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6	determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why
2 3 4 5 6 7	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the	2 3 4 5 6 7	determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d),	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage its tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau: "Except as provided in Paragraph 18, the design of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage its tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of a run-of-river HEP is tied to the flow of the particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau: "Except as provided in Paragraph 18, the design of any new Run-of-River Plant shall conform to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of a run-of-river HEP is tied to the flow of the particular river on which it is situated at a particular time. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau: "Except as provided in Paragraph 18, the design of any new Run-of-River Plant shall conform to the following criteria:" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of a run-of-river HEP is tied to the flow of the particular river on which it is situated at a particular time. If the flow of the river is high at the particular time,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau: "Except as provided in Paragraph 18, the design of any new Run-of-River Plant shall conform to the following criteria:" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of a run-of-river HEP is tied to the flow of the particular river on which it is situated at a particular time. If the flow of the river is high at the particular time, the HEP may produce considerable power when that flow,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau: "Except as provided in Paragraph 18, the design of any new Run-of-River Plant shall conform to the following criteria:" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage its eff. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of a run-of-river HEP is tied to the flow of the particular river on which it is situated at a particular time. If the flow of the river is high at the particular time, the HEP may produce considerable power when that flow, or part thereof, is diverted through its turbines. If
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau: "Except as provided in Paragraph 18, the design of any new Run-of-River Plant shall conform to the following criteria:" And then of course we've got the text of the provision itself: 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of a run-of-river HEP is tied to the flow of the particular river on which it is situated at a particular time. If the flow of the river is high at the particular time, the HEP may produce considerable power when that flow,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau: "Except as provided in Paragraph 18, the design of any new Run-of-River Plant shall conform to the following criteria:" And then of course we've got the text of the provision itself: 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of a run-of-river HEP is tied to the flow of the particular river on which it is situated at a particular time, the HEP may produce considerable power when that flow, or part thereof, is diverted through its turbines. If the flow of the river is low at that particular time, the HEP will produce less power.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau: "Except as provided in Paragraph 18, the design of any new Run-of-River Plant shall conform to the following criteria:" And then of course we've got the text of the provision itself: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the pondage required for Firm Power." 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of a run-of-river HEP is tied to the flow of the particular river on which it is situated at a particular time, the HEP may produce considerable power when that flow, or part thereof, is diverted through its turbines. If the flow of the river is low at that particular time,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court, today I will be on my feet for slightly longer than yesterday, addressing you on the calculation of maximum allowable pondage under paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D of the Treaty. (Slide 3) As the Court will recall, this is the subject of the question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d), which is on the slide: "With respect to Annexure D, paragraph 8(c), what is to be taken into account for the purposes of calculating maximum allowable pondage for a plant, and what is to be excluded?" (Slide 4) So on the slide we have the critical provision, which is paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D itself. So first we've got our common paragraph 8 chapeau: "Except as provided in Paragraph 18, the design of any new Run-of-River Plant shall conform to the following criteria:" And then of course we've got the text of the provision itself: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the pondage required for Firm Power." Sir Daniel has already situated this provision 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	determine pondage required for firm power under paragraph 8(c), which is then doubled to fix the volume of the operating pool. Fourth, I will address you on India's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage and explain why it cannot be correct. And finally, I will tie all of this together to answer shortly, I hope the Court's question set out in PO6, paragraph 35(d) on the calculation of maximum pondage. (Slide 6) So with all that said, let's turn to the concept of pondage itself. The concept of pondage is tied to the concept of a run-of-river plant generally. As we know, and as its name suggests, the power production potential of a run-of-river HEP is tied to the flow of the particular river on which it is situated at a particular time. If the flow of the river is high at the particular time, the HEP may produce considerable power when that flow, or part thereof, is diverted through its turbines. If the flow of the river is low at that particular time, the HEP will produce less power. (Slide 7) Now, run-of-river HEPs on Himalayan rivers

09:38 1	which the flow of those rivers varies throughout the	09:41 1	a storage work.
2	year. So on the slide I've got for you the hydrograph	2	Second, the designer can reconcile themselves to
3	for the Neelum River, which dictates the operations of	3	their fate and build a pure run-of-river plant. That is
4	the Neelum-Jhelum plant that we visited earlier this	4	a HEP that simply takes what the river provides at any
4	-	4 5	given moment, and produces power accordingly. Such
5	year. As we can see there, in the wet season, water is	5	a HEP is still very useful, and may have a significant
0 7	plentiful due to snow and glacial melt, as well as	7	installed capacity, such as India's Salal HEP, which is
8	rainfall. And in the dry season, the situation is	8	rated for 690 MW.
o 9	reversed: the water is locked up high in the mountains	8 9	Third and this is where Annexure D comes in
9 10	and there is relatively little rain, decreasing the	9 10	the design can turn part of the HEP's reservoir, which
10	river flow significantly.	10	is ordinarily used for the creation of generating head,
11	From the HEP's perspective, this creates something	11	into an operating pool. The Court is obviously familiar
12	of a feast-or-famine situation. And you'll see on the	12	with such a design because it was deployed at the 969 MW
13	hydrograph a red dotted line, and that line reflects the	13	NJHEP which was the subject of the site visit. And this
15	HEP's design discharge: the flow necessary for it to	14	is India's preferred HEP design.
15	generate power at its installed capacity.	15	In such a scenario, rather than running the HEP
10	Where the flow exceeds the design discharge, the HEP	10	constantly, the operator will shut down or reduce
18	may be run constantly at full power 24 hours a day. For	18	production for part of the day that corresponds to low
10	the NJHEP, as you can see, this will be the case only	10	power demand, enabling water to be stored in the
20	during the summer wet season, with meltwater and monsoon	20	operating pool during that time. For the rest of the
20	rains.	20 21	day, the water stored in the operating pool will be
22	But where the flow falls below the design discharge,	21	released through the HEP's turbines at times of peak
22	which is 280 metres a second for the NJHEP, continuous	23	demand, thus temporarily supplementing the natural river
23 24	operation at full power will not be possible. While the	23	inflow with water releases from storage. And that's
25	HEP will still produce power potentially considerable	25	commonly termed "power peaking".
	Page 5		Page 7
09:40 1	power constantly over those 24 hours, the power so	09:42 1	The result of power peaking is that for the part of
09:40 1 2	produced will be less perhaps much less than the	09:42 1 2	the day in which water in the operating pool is
	produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not		the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power
2 3 4	produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast.	2 3 4	the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the
2 3	produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled	2 3	the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the
2 3 4 5 6	produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the	2 3 4 5 6	the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is
2 3 4 5 6 7	produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions.	2 3 4 5 6 7	the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the wet season, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the natural flow of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the wet season, which can then be used to supplement the natural flow of the river during the dry season, enabling the production 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the mutual flow of the river during the dry season, enabling the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed capacity, or, as a minimum, providing at least 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the operating pool?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the natural flow of the river during the dry season, enabling the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed capacity, or, as a minimum, providing at least an enhanced amount of power during the dry season. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the operating pool? (Slide 10) As you will remember from
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the wet season, which can then be used to supplement the natural flow of the river during the dry season, enabling the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed capacity, or, as a minimum, providing at least an enhanced amount of power during the dry season. And that's what Pakistan has done for the 4,888 MW 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the operating pool? (Slide 10) As you will remember from Hameedullah Khan's presentation on power production
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the wet season, which can then be used to supplement the natural flow of the river during the dry season, enabling the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed capacity, or, as a minimum, providing at least an enhanced amount of power during the dry season. And that's what Pakistan has done for the 4,888 MW Tarbela HEP on the Indus River. And the reservoir of 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the operating pool? (Slide 10) As you will remember from Hameedullah Khan's presentation on power production during the site visit, in a country like Pakistan, the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the wet season, which can then be used to supplement the natural flow of the river during the dry season, enabling the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed capacity, or, as a minimum, providing at least an enhanced amount of power during the dry season. And that's what Pakistan has done for the 4,888 MW Tarbela HEP on the Indus River. And the reservoir of that HEP stores a portion of the monsoon water in the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the operating pool? (Slide 10) As you will remember from Hameedullah Khan's presentation on power production during the site visit, in a country like Pakistan, the plant operator will be told when to operate the plant by
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed capacity, or, as a minimum, providing at least an enhanced amount of power during the dry season. And that's what Pakistan has done for the 4,888 MW Tarbela HEP on the Indus River. And the reservoir of that HEP stores a portion of the monsoon water in the wet season, for use in the dry season, for both power 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the operating pool? (Slide 10) As you will remember from Hameedullah Khan's presentation on power production during the site visit, in a country like Pakistan, the plant operator will be told when to operate the plant by the power system's dispatch operator. The system
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed capacity, or, as a minimum, providing at least an enhanced amount of power during the dry season. And that's what Pakistan has done for the 4,888 MW Tarbela HEP on the Indus River. And the reservoir of that HEP stores a portion of the monsoon water in the wet season, for use in the dry season, for both power production and irrigation supply. Now, of course such 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the operating pool? (Slide 10) As you will remember from Hameedullah Khan's presentation on power production during the site visit, in a country like Pakistan, the plant operator will be told when to operate the plant by the power system's dispatch operator. The system operator may call on power from all generating units
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed capacity, or, as a minimum, providing at least an enhanced amount of power during the dry season. And that's what Pakistan has done for the 4,888 MW Tarbela HEP on the Indus River. And the reservoir of that HEP stores a portion of the monsoon water in the wet season, for use in the dry season, for both power 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the operating pool? (Slide 10) As you will remember from Hameedullah Khan's presentation on power production during the site visit, in a country like Pakistan, the plant operator will be told when to operate the plant by the power system's dispatch operator. The system
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 produced will be less perhaps much less than the installed capacity of the plant. There will simply not be enough flow for the plant to be run full blast. This is yet another problem that must be tackled during the HEP's design phase. And engineers being the ingenious people they are, there are multiple solutions. (Slide 8) So we have three basic solutions for you on the slide, and that slide has been adapted from presentation 5, as explained by Mr Farooq during the site visit. First, our designer can attach the HEP to a storage work with a massive reservoir. And that reservoir will retain a colossal volume of water during the production of near constant power year-round at the HEP's installed capacity, or, as a minimum, providing at least an enhanced amount of power during the dry season. And that's what Pakistan has done for the 4,888 MW Tarbela HEP on the Indus River. And the reservoir of that HEP stores a portion of the monsoon water in the wet season, for use in the dry season, for both power production and irrigation supply. Now, of course such 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 the day in which water in the operating pool is released, the HEP operator will be able to produce power at a higher rate than they otherwise could with the river's natural flow, and potentially as high as the HEP's installed capacity. And that stored water is called "pondage". (Slide 9) On the slide, you can see we have an accepted engineering definition of the term, taken from a recognised industry text called the Hydropower Engineering Handbook (P-477). And there you will see it says that "pondage" is: " short-term storage of water, usually on a daily basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand." Just to continue with our introduction to the concept in view, how does the HEP operator determine when to store and when to release pondage in the operating pool? (Slide 10) As you will remember from Hameedullah Khan's presentation on power production during the site visit, in a country like Pakistan, the plant operator will be told when to operate the plant by the power system's dispatch operator. The system operator may call on power from all generating units

00.44 1		00.46 1	
09:44 1	time-variant demands of power consumers which is	09:46 1	24-hour period, it will store water in the operating
2	reflected in the load curve at the lowest generating	2	pool, and then come online to meet the peak demand for
3	cost.	3	a limited time, say a few hours, before returning to
4	On the slide, we have a sample load curve on the	4	storage mode once more.
5	left from the US Army Corps of Engineers' Hydropower	5	And in the middle, we have something that we call
6	Manual (P-302). It's a daily load curve. And we can	6	"intermediate power", or an "intermediate plant". This
7	see here that the HEP operator is likely to be directed	7	is something of an in-between option. Using pondage, it
8	to store water when demand is low overnight, and then	8	can provide power for longer than a peaking plant, but
9	release it during the day when demand is higher. Not	9	less time than a baseload plant.
10	only will the HEP operator get a better price for their	10	Now, all of these HEPs may play a meaningful role in
11	electricity during this time, they will assist in	11	a power system, provided their role in that system is
12	meeting peak demand.	12	carefully planned, with a view to their limitations as
13	Now, of course, it's not enough for a HEP to meet	13	HEPs.
14	demand or part of demand for a day: it must meet it for	14	(Slide 11) This basic division is recognised by the
15	the next day as well, and the day after that, and the	15	US Army Corps of Engineers in its Hydropower Engineering
16	day after that. But humans are predictable. On most	16	Manual, to which Mr Khan referred, and we see the
17	days, they will display the same behaviour: rising in	17	division there on the slide. A baseload plant is
18	the morning, working during the day and sleeping at	18	producing power 24 hours a day; a HEP with intermediate
19	night.	19	loading is producing power for 8 to 14 hours a day; and
20	On the working days, Monday through Friday, they	20	a HEP with a peak loading is producing power for 8 hours
21	will be broadly consistent, resulting in maybe one or	21	a day or less. And this is reflected in the associated
22	two daily peak periods. On the weekend days of Saturday	22	load curve, which we saw here as the daily load curve on
23	and Sunday, they will also be consistent, but the peaks	23	the previous slide.
24	may be lower as people are not going to work. And that	24	(Slide 12) Now, just to take this point a little bit
25	can be seen reflected in the weekly load curve on the	25	further, I now have for you on the slide, side by side,
	D ₁ = = 0		Dec. 11
	Page 9		Page 11
09:45 1	right. As can be appreciated from this, the power	09:48 1	two load duration curves. Now, you'll remember Mr Rae
09:45 1 2	right. As can be appreciated from this, the power system will be required to meet the same broad pattern	09:48 1 2	two load duration curves. Now, you'll remember Mr Rae referred to these.
2	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern	2	referred to these.
2 3	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute	2 3	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on
2 3 4	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday.	2 3 4	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived
2 3 4 5	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ	2 3 4 5	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the
2 3 4 5 6	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power	2 3 4 5 6	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to
2 3 4 5 6 7	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the	2 3 4 5 6 7	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In basic terms, what pondage will do, therefore, is grant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In basic terms, what pondage will do, therefore, is grant a Himalayan run-of-river plant greater flexibility in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP being used for baseload power. And you'll see from the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ \end{array} $	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In basic terms, what pondage will do, therefore, is grant a Himalayan run-of-river plant greater flexibility in operation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP being used for baseload power. And you'll see from the Y-axis that that's not providing very much of that
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In basic terms, what pondage will do, therefore, is grant a Himalayan run-of-river plant greater flexibility in operation. As Mr Khan and Arshad Malik explained on the site	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP being used for baseload power. And you'll see from the Y-axis that that's not providing very much of that power: maybe 20 MW or so, it's hard to tell. But it's
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In basic terms, what pondage will do, therefore, is grant a Himalayan run-of-river plant greater flexibility in operation. As Mr Khan and Arshad Malik explained on the site visit, in the wet season the run-of-river HEP with	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP being used for baseload power. And you'll see from the Y-axis that that's not providing very much of that power: maybe 20 MW or so, it's hard to tell. But it's doing it continuously throughout our 24-hour period.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In basic terms, what pondage will do, therefore, is grant a Himalayan run-of-river plant greater flexibility in operation. As Mr Khan and Arshad Malik explained on the site visit, in the wet season the run-of-river HEP with pondage will operate as a baseload plant. As the flow	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP being used for baseload power. And you'll see from the Y-axis that that's not providing very much of that power: maybe 20 MW or so, it's hard to tell. But it's doing it continuously throughout our 24-hour period. In the duration curve on the left, we have the same
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In basic terms, what pondage will do, therefore, is grant a Himalayan run-of-river plant greater flexibility in operation. As Mr Khan and Arshad Malik explained on the site visit, in the wet season the run-of-river HEP with pondage will operate as a baseload plant. As the flow is plentiful, the plant can run constantly at its	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP being used for baseload power. And you'll see from the Y-axis that that's not providing very much of that power: maybe 20 MW or so, it's hard to tell. But it's doing it continuously throughout our 24-hour period. In the duration curve on the left, we have the same HEP being used for peaking power. And you can see that
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In basic terms, what pondage will do, therefore, is grant a Himalayan run-of-river plant greater flexibility in operation. As Mr Khan and Arshad Malik explained on the site visit, in the wet season the run-of-river HEP with pondage will operate as a baseload plant. As the flow is plentiful, the plant can run constantly at its installed capacity.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP being used for baseload power. And you'll see from the Y-axis that that's not providing very much of that power: maybe 20 MW or so, it's hard to tell. But it's doing it continuously throughout our 24-hour period. In the duration curve on the left, we have the same HEP being used for peaking power. And you can see that using its pondage, it's able to service a much deeper
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	system will be required to meet the same broad pattern from Monday to Friday, and then a similar but less acute pattern on Saturday and Sunday. Now, obviously the size of the peaks may differ throughout the year, depending on different power requirements. Power demand in Pakistan and India in the summer is much higher, for example, owing to the use of air-conditioning. But the basic diurnal pattern, with people sleeping at night and being active during the day, will remain the same. What the weekly load curve therefore shows is really seven daily load curves. Provided that the demand for each individual day is met, the weekly demand will also be taken care of from a power system perspective. In basic terms, what pondage will do, therefore, is grant a Himalayan run-of-river plant greater flexibility in operation. As Mr Khan and Arshad Malik explained on the site visit, in the wet season the run-of-river HEP with pondage will operate as a baseload plant. As the flow is plentiful, the plant can run constantly at its installed capacity. In contrast, during the dry season it will operate	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	referred to these. You'll recall from Mr Khan's presentation to you on the site visit that load duration curves are derived from load curves, rearranging them from showing the demand within a power system at a particular time to showing how much power is required as a percentage of a given time period; so over 24 hours, which is what these are showing. So baseload power is going to be required for 100% of the period. The plant providing it, therefore, is going to be at or near the bottom of the curve. Peaking power will be required for far less time, and therefore it's going to be at or near the top of the curve. And intermediate power will be somewhere in between. In the duration curve on the right, we see the HEP being used for baseload power. And you'll see from the Y-axis that that's not providing very much of that power: maybe 20 MW or so, it's hard to tell. But it's doing it continuously throughout our 24-hour period. In the duration curve on the left, we have the same HEP being used for peaking power. And you can see that using its pondage, it's able to service a much deeper slice of the curve: I think that's maybe 100 MW. But

09:49 1	of the relevant 24-hour period, being limited by the	09:52 1	what elements of design would cause him to pick
2	volume of water that the river delivers into the	2	a capacity at the red line? Or why isn't it higher or
3	reservoir over 24 hours. So in this case it's providing	3	lower, given that there's a very significant shift in
4	intermediate power: it's about 9.6 hours, I think.	4	hydrology, particularly at this at any site, but at
5	Now, even a run-of-river HEP with limited pondage is	5	this site?
6	still extremely useful from a system planning	6	So I'm just wondering whether you have any insight
7	perspective. It will still be operating as a baseload	7	on why the plant designer decided to set the plant
8	plant during the wet season; and in the dry season, it	8	capacity for this site at that line, and whether pondage
9	will still function as a useful peaking plant, just with	9	was an influence.
10	peaks of a shorter duration.	10	DR MILES: Are you referring to the Neelum-Jhelum plant in
10	Now, with careful planning, in the context of	10	particular?
12	an entire power system with hundreds of plants all over	12	DR BLACKMORE: I'm referring to this one here. It doesn't
12	the place, this is not going to pose a significant	12	matter whether I think it's the same issue whether
13	impediment. And in the context of our left-hand	13	it's Neelum-Jhelum
15	duration curve, this means that the HEP will still be	15	DR MILES: You're asking as a general
16	occupying a meaningful slot at the top of the curve, and	16	DR BLACKMORE: It's a general question related. But seeing
10	a power system operator will still be grateful for its	10	you put up a slide of a plant without a name on it,
18	presence and ability to serve as a peaking plant.	18	I'm assuming it's Neelum-Jhelum.
10	Now, this brings me to my final introductory point	10	DR MILES: It is indeed Neelum-Jhelum.
20	on pondage, which is how the maximum pondage of a HEP	20	I'm not an engineer, that seems like quite
20	the size of the operating pool is fixed in the course	20	a detailed question, so I will speak, as always, under
22	of the HEP's design.	22	the control of my engineering colleagues. But
23	Now, one could ask the question: why do you need to	23	a number of factors will go into that, it seems to me.
23 24	fix the operating pool as part of the HEP's design?	23 24	Obviously your installed capacity is going to be
25	Can't you just expand it or contract it in accordance	25	determined by: what are you going to put in the grid,
	Page 13		Page 15
09:50 1	with need? And the answer to this is: no. And it's	09:53 1	what's the demand in the grid. It's also going to be
09:50 1	with need? And the answer to this is: no. And it's a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool	09:53 1	what's the demand in the grid. It's also going to be fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am
2	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool	2	fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am
2 3	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the	2 3	fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that
2 3 4	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is	2 3 4	fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of
2 3 4 5	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be.	2 3 4 5	fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature.
2 3 4 5 6	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in	2 3 4 5 6	fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during
2 3 4 5 6 7	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all	2 3 4 5 6 7	fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably amI going to be able to generate power above thatinstalled capacity throughout the year and things ofthat nature.But I can get a more precise answer for you duringthe coffee break and get back to you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: I thought I'd ask a question before we get 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation. DR BLACKMORE: So my second question goes to slide 12.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: I thought I'd ask a question before we get into the whole presentation, because we've had a couple 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation. DR BLACKMORE: So my second question goes to slide 12. I've hopefully got this one right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: I thought I'd ask a question before we get into the whole presentation, because we've had a couple of slides that I just would like some clarification on. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation. DR BLACKMORE: So my second question goes to slide 12. I've hopefully got this one right. When you were introducing this, you it's a small
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: I thought I'd ask a question before we get into the whole presentation, because we've had a couple of slides that I just would like some clarification on. So can we go back to slide 7, please. (Pause) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation. DR BLACKMORE: So my second question goes to slide 12. I've hopefully got this one right. When you were introducing this, you it's a small point, but it's important, I think, just in the context
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: I thought I'd ask a question before we get into the whole presentation, because we've had a couple of slides that I just would like some clarification on. So can we go back to slide 7, please. (Pause) I'm just interested in your view, given we're going 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation. DR BLACKMORE: So my second question goes to slide 12. I've hopefully got this one right. When you were introducing this, you it's a small point, but it's important, I think, just in the context of scale. I think you said the hydro on the right-hand
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: I thought I'd ask a question before we get into the whole presentation, because we've had a couple of slides that I just would like some clarification on. So can we go back to slide 7, please. (Pause) I'm just interested in your view, given we're going to talk about pondage and we're talking about the total 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation. DR BLACKMORE: So my second question goes to slide 12. I've hopefully got this one right. When you were introducing this, you it's a small point, but it's important, I think, just in the context of scale. I think you said the hydro on the right-hand one was 20 MW. When I'm reading it, I've got 200. I'm
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: I thought I'd ask a question before we get into the whole presentation, because we've had a couple of slides that I just would like some clarification on. So can we go back to slide 7, please. (Pause) I'm just interested in your view, given we're going to talk about pondage and we're talking about the total environment of a river system. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation. DR BLACKMORE: So my second question goes to slide 12. I've hopefully got this one right. When you were introducing this, you it's a small point, but it's important, I think, just in the context of scale. I think you said the hydro on the right-hand one was 20 MW. When I'm reading it, I've got 200. I'm just wondering whether that was an oversight or I've
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: I thought I'd ask a question before we get into the whole presentation, because we've had a couple of slides that I just would like some clarification on. So can we go back to slide 7, please. (Pause) I'm just interested in your view, given we're going to talk about pondage and we're talking about the total 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation. DR BLACKMORE: So my second question goes to slide 12. I've hopefully got this one right. When you were introducing this, you it's a small point, but it's important, I think, just in the context of scale. I think you said the hydro on the right-hand one was 20 MW. When I'm reading it, I've got 200. I'm
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 a "no" because fixing the size of the operating pool means fixing the dead storage level within the reservoir, and therefore fixing where your intake is going to be. And as we heard from Professor Webb yesterday, in her presentation on outlets, spillways and intakes, all of these design elements, which are self-evidently not capable of being moved once you render them in concrete, are situated at, around or otherwise relative to the dead storage level. Thus, the HEP designer must fix the volume of the operating pool ab initio. (Slide 13) So what are the ordinary design principles that are applicable to pondage? Pakistan dealt with this in its Memorial at paragraph 4.67. THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Dr Miles. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: I thought I'd ask a question before we get into the whole presentation, because we've had a couple of slides that I just would like some clarification on. So can we go back to slide 7, please. (Pause) I'm just interested in your view, given we're going to talk about pondage and we're talking about the total environment of a river system. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 fixed by the hydrology I mean, how reliably am I going to be able to generate power above that installed capacity throughout the year and things of that nature. But I can get a more precise answer for you during the coffee break and get back to you. DR BLACKMORE: Well, my specific question is: does whatever the calculation of pondage, which we're getting to, wherever that takes us to a conclusion on pondage, influence the selection of the red line? That's my question. DR MILES: Not under the Treaty, is the answer. The Treaty fixes pondage by reference to one thing, and one thing only, and that's the minimum mean discharge. The installed capacity of the plant does not feature into the calculation. DR BLACKMORE: So my second question goes to slide 12. I've hopefully got this one right. When you were introducing this, you it's a small point, but it's important, I think, just in the context of scale. I think you said the hydro on the right-hand one was 20 MW. When I'm reading it, I've got 200. I'm just wondering whether that was an oversight or I've

00.55 1	DD MILES, Langer Land, this is just mer liftly load	00.57 1	to an and the second
09:55 1	DR MILES: I mean, I read this is just me. If the load	09:57 1	it was a point made, perhaps implicitly, by Mr Minear on
2	is from 0 to 6 in the Y-axis, I read that as 0 at the	2	the site visit and it's the role of legal regulation
3	very bottom of the Y-axis being zero power and the top	3	in the HEP's design. As Dr Hayat pointed out in his
4	of the axis being 1,000, it's only sort of a tiny slice	4	presentation on HEP design and planning, legal
5	of that. So 200 would be about a fifth of the way up.	5	regulation is one of the major factors to be taken into
6	DR BLACKMORE: Well, the increments are in 1,000 MW. So the	6	account as part of the HEP design process.
7	1 is 1,000 MW.	7	The principles I have just discussed, as Mr Minear
8	DR MILES: Oh, I read that differently. I read that as the	8	pointed out, are free of such regulation, reflecting the
9	total load being 1,000 MW. But if that's the case, then	9	approach taken if the HEP designer is left to their own
10	you're right: it would be 200 MW.	10	devices. But where there is legal regulation, the
11	DR BLACKMORE: Okay. I'm just trying to understand it,	11	designer will need to change perhaps drastically
12	because it affects the way you translate it to the left	12	their approach to the design of the operating pool.
13	side.	13	And this is not a hardship for the designer, or at
14	DR MILES: I'm happy to be corrected.	14	any rate not an unexpected hardship. For the designer,
15	DR BLACKMORE: Okay, thank you.	15	legal regulation is not the only or even the most
16	DR MILES: (Slide 13) So we can just go back to this. If	16	constraining element of HEP design. Like hydrology or
17	you recall, the answer that I gave or the Memorial	17	geology or project financing, designing within the
18	gave (paragraph 4.67) for the ordinary principles	18	framework of the existing regulations is simply
19	applicable to the calculation of pondage:	19	a reality of the challenging process in which they have
20	"Under ordinary principles of design a point that	20	chosen to engage. And the regulation of pondage is one
21	requires emphasis in the context of the present case	21	such design constraint that we are here today to
22	there is no fixed methodology for determining how much	22	discuss, as reflected in the Indus Waters Treaty.
23	pondage a HEP will require or be permitted to have.	23	(Slide 15) With that in mind, I turn to the second
24	However, the provision of pondage, and ensuring that it	24	part of my submissions, on the relevant provisions of
25	remains free of sediment, will incur both capital and	25	the Treaty and its Annexure D.
	Page 17		Page 19
	, C		C C
09:56 1	operational costs. Thus, the rational selection of	09:58 1	(Slide 16) There can be no doubt that the Treaty
2	pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and	09:58 1 2	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now
	pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from		regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The
2	pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices	2 3 4	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by
2 3	pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from	2 3	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The
2 3 4 5 6	pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's	2 3 4 5 6	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e)
2 3 4 5 6 7	pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As	2 3 4 5 6 7	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. Their lives may be much easier without it. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now. (Slide 17) We start with familiar ground, which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. Their lives may be much easier without it. A cost/benefit analysis is required to determine just 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now. (Slide 17) We start with familiar ground, which is Article III of the Treaty proper, which is now back on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. Their lives may be much easier without it. A cost/benefit analysis is required to determine just how much pondage is required, and this will vary from 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now. (Slide 17) We start with familiar ground, which is Article III of the Treaty proper, which is now back on the slide. Professor Webb has already addressed you on
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. Their lives may be much easier without it. A cost/benefit analysis is required to determine just how much pondage is required, and this will vary from site to site, and indeed from power system to power 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now. (Slide 17) We start with familiar ground, which is Article III of the Treaty proper, which is now back on the slide. Professor Webb has already addressed you on Article III in detail, but it is important that we hit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. Their lives may be much easier without it. A cost/benefit analysis is required to determine just how much pondage is required, and this will vary from site to site, and indeed from power system to power system. As I said yesterday in relation to freeboard, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now. (Slide 17) We start with familiar ground, which is Article III of the Treaty proper, which is now back on the slide. Professor Webb has already addressed you on Article III in detail, but it is important that we hit on some key points.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. Their lives may be much easier without it. A cost/benefit analysis is required to determine just how much pondage is required, and this will vary from site to site, and indeed from power system to power system. As I said yesterday in relation to these 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now. (Slide 17) We start with familiar ground, which is Article III of the Treaty proper, which is now back on the slide. Professor Webb has already addressed you on Article III in detail, but it is important that we hit on some key points. Again I'd like to draw your attention to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. Their lives may be much easier without it. A cost/benefit analysis is required to determine just how much pondage is required, and this will vary from site to site, and indeed from power system to power system. As I said yesterday in relation to these issues. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now. (Slide 17) We start with familiar ground, which is Article III of the Treaty proper, which is now back on the slide. Professor Webb has already addressed you on Article III in detail, but it is important that we hit on some key points. Again I'd like to draw your attention to Article III(1), which is the core promise of the Treaty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. Their lives may be much easier without it. A cost/benefit analysis is required to determine just how much pondage is required, and this will vary from site to site, and indeed from power system to power system. As I said yesterday in relation to these issues. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now. (Slide 17) We start with familiar ground, which is Article III of the Treaty proper, which is now back on the slide. Professor Webb has already addressed you on Article III in detail, but it is important that we hit on some key points. Again I'd like to draw your attention to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 pondage capacity will usually balance these capital and operational costs against the income anticipated from delivery of power during peak hours when energy prices are higher." Now, put it another way: pondage is expensive. It's expensive to build and it's expensive to maintain. As Mr Farooq pointed out on the site visit, a large operating pool may entail having to build either a taller dam or undertake greater excavation at the site of the HEP's construction, which will entail capital costs at the outset of the project. And it will need to be kept free of sediment, entailing the use of sediment management processes, which in turn will entail operational costs over the lifetime of the HEP. So a HEP's designer doesn't incorporate pondage into a HEP's design purely for the sake of having pondage. Their lives may be much easier without it. A cost/benefit analysis is required to determine just how much pondage is required, and this will vary from site to site, and indeed from power system to power system. As I said yesterday in relation to these issues. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	regulates pondage. Paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D, now back on the slide, makes that abundantly clear. The maximum pondage in the operating pool is limited by paragraph 8(c), in the same way that paragraph 8(d) limits the placement of outlets and paragraph 8(e) limits the design of spillways, and so on and so forth. But as I alluded to yesterday, unlike those other subparagraphs of paragraph 8, paragraph 8(c) does not allow for any margin of appreciation based on "sound and economical design", "satisfactory operation of the works", or any other kind of cognate concept. It is a criterion of HEP design that India limit the size of its HEP's operating pool to "twice the Pondage required for Firm Power". The seriousness of this criterion is made clear when we step back and look at its wider context, and I'll take you through that now. (Slide 17) We start with familiar ground, which is Article III of the Treaty proper, which is now back on the slide. Professor Webb has already addressed you on Article III in detail, but it is important that we hit on some key points. Again I'd like to draw your attention to Article III(1), which is the core promise of the Treaty

10:00 1	"Pakistan shall receive for unrestricted use all	10:02 1	paragraph 8(c) and the subject of my submissions today.
2	those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under	2	As an aside, it commented on Annexure E in the
3	an obligation to let flow under the provisions of	3	process, perhaps answering at least in part some
4	Paragraph (2)."	4	of your questions, Mr Chairman, on that annexure
5	Now let's go on to paragraph (2):	4 5	yesterday, and whether Annexure E allows India
	"India shall be under an obligation to let flow all	6	considerable storage. In short, in the view of the
6	-		
7	the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit	7	Kishenganga Court, it does not. And at paragraph 504 of
8	any interference with those waters, except for the	8	the partial award (PLA-3), the Kishenganga Court said:
9	following uses"	9	" one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is
10	Now, as Professor Webb noted, and as Pakistan has	10	to limit the storage of water by India on the Western
11	made clear in its Memorial in many places, this language	11	Rivers (and, correspondingly, to prohibit entirely the
12	constitutes the rule. Everything that comes after it is	12	storage of water by Pakistan on the upper reaches of the
13	necessarily and unavoidably an exception; an exception,	13	Eastern Rivers). Annexure E to the Treaty strictly
14	moreover, for which the context of Article III, and the	14	limits the volume of General Storage, Power Storage, and
15	wider history of the Treaty, mandates a narrow	15	Flood Storage that India may develop on each of the
16	interpretation.	16	Western Rivers."
17	As the Court is aware, one of those narrow	17	Now, Pakistan agrees with this, obviously. A core
18	exceptions is set out in Article III(2)(d), which refers	18	animus of the Treaty, as reflected in Article III, is
19	to "Generation of hydroelectric power, as set out in	19	the need to prevent India from retaining the waters of
20	Annexure D". But there is of course a further	20	the Western Rivers. Only in this way could Pakistan's
21	prohibition in Article III, and this is set out in	21	interests and the hydrology of the Western Rivers be
22	Article III(4):	22	protected.
23	"Except as provided in Annexures D and E, India	23	The Kishenganga Court continued, addressing the
24	shall not store any water of, or construct any storage	24	question of maximum pondage directly. It said:
25	works on, the Western Rivers."	25	"For new Run-of-River Plants, Annexure D likewise
	Page 21		Page 23
10:01 1	As with Articles III(1) and (2), Article III(4) sets	10:04 1	restricts the permissible volume of pondage, and pegs
2	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which	2	this limit to power generation at the minimum mean
2 3	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the		this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site."
2 3 4	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again	2 3 4	this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to
2 3	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which	2 3 4 5	this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum
2 3 4 5 6	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly	2 3 4 5 6	this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site."We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c).
2 3 4 5 6 7	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted.	2 3 4 5 6 7	this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site."We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following. This was the point in the negotiations where India's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it achieved a careful balance between the Parties'
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following. This was the point in the negotiations where India's hydroelectric use of the waters of the Western Rivers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it achieved a careful balance between the Parties' respective negotiating positions, allowing India
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following. This was the point in the negotiations where India's hydroelectric use of the waters of the Western Rivers came into sharp focus. And a persistent feature of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it achieved a careful balance between the Parties' respective negotiating positions, allowing India hydro-electric use of the waters of the Western Rivers
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following. This was the point in the negotiations where India's hydroelectric use of the waters of the Western Rivers came into sharp focus. And a persistent feature of the negotiations throughout that time was Pakistan's	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it achieved a careful balance between the Parties' respective negotiating positions, allowing India hydro-electric use of the waters of the Western Rivers while protecting Pakistan against the possibility of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following. This was the point in the negotiations where India's hydroelectric use of the waters of the Western Rivers came into sharp focus. And a persistent feature of the negotiations throughout that time was Pakistan's agitation at India using the reservoirs of its HEPs to	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it achieved a careful balance between the Parties' respective negotiating positions, allowing India hydro-electric use of the waters of the Western Rivers while protecting Pakistan against the possibility of water storage on the upstream reaches of those Rivers
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following. This was the point in the negotiations where India's hydroelectric use of the waters of the Western Rivers came into sharp focus. And a persistent feature of the negotiations throughout that time was Pakistan's agitation at India using the reservoirs of its HEPs to prevent water from reaching Pakistan.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it achieved a careful balance between the Parties' respective negotiating positions, allowing India hydro-electric use of the waters of the Western Rivers while protecting Pakistan against the possibility of water storage on the upstream reaches of those Rivers having an unduly disruptive effect on the flow of water
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following. This was the point in the negotiations where India's hydroelectric use of the waters of the Western Rivers came into sharp focus. And a persistent feature of the negotiations throughout that time was Pakistan's agitation at India using the reservoirs of its HEPs to prevent water from reaching Pakistan. (Slide 18) In view of this, the Kishenganga Court	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it achieved a careful balance between the Parties' respective negotiating positions, allowing India hydro-electric use of the waters of the Western Rivers while protecting Pakistan against the possibility of water storage on the upstream reaches of those Rivers having an unduly disruptive effect on the flow of water to Pakistan."
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following. This was the point in the negotiations where India's hydroelectric use of the waters of the Western Rivers came into sharp focus. And a persistent feature of the negotiations throughout that time was Pakistan's agitation at India using the reservoirs of its HEPs to prevent water from reaching Pakistan. (Slide 18) In view of this, the Kishenganga Court held as follows, in terms that Pakistan considers	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it achieved a careful balance between the Parties' respective negotiating positions, allowing India hydro-electric use of the waters of the Western Rivers while protecting Pakistan against the possibility of water storage on the upstream reaches of those Rivers having an unduly disruptive effect on the flow of water to Pakistan."
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	out the rule with respect to storage of waters which self-evidently includes pondage by India on the Western Rivers. The rule is: no storage, subject again to the exception of Annexures D and E, both of which fall, in Pakistan's submission, to be narrowly interpreted. Now, I won't dwell on it overmuch, as Ms Rees-Evans has already addressed it. But this understanding of Article III(4) is amplified by the travaux préparatoires. An analysis of the relevant part of the travaux is provided in Appendix A to the Memorial, particularly insofar as that analysis concerns the negotiations from August to September 1959 onwards. And for your note, you can find that at paragraph 115 of Appendix A and following. This was the point in the negotiations where India's hydroelectric use of the waters of the Western Rivers came into sharp focus. And a persistent feature of the negotiations throughout that time was Pakistan's agitation at India using the reservoirs of its HEPs to prevent water from reaching Pakistan. (Slide 18) In view of this, the Kishenganga Court	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 this limit to power generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at the site." We will return to this presently, but suffice to say, this reflects Pakistan's position on maximum pondage and the proper interpretation of paragraph 8(c). It does not reflect India's. The Kishenganga Court went on: "These are not generous limits the volume of storage permitted to India on the Jhelum Main, for example, is zero" That's storage under Annexure E: " and even the limited available record of the Treaty's negotiating history suggests that these amounts of storage were a key point of contention between the Parties. The outcome was significant in that it achieved a careful balance between the Parties' respective negotiating positions, allowing India hydro-electric use of the waters of the Western Rivers while protecting Pakistan against the possibility of water storage on the upstream reaches of those Rivers having an unduly disruptive effect on the flow of water to Pakistan."

10:05 1	and the limitations on Indian storage on the Western	10:08 1	an interpreter of the Treaty is faced with a situation
2	Rivers that it imposes, within the Treaty. This refers	2	in which it considers two readings of its provisions to
3	not only to India's capacity to construct storage works	3	be open to it on a question related to Indian storage on
4	under Annexure E, but the amount of live storage	4	the Western Rivers, either under Annexure D or E for
5	pondage that India is entitled to when constructing	5	that matter, the interpreter is, in Pakistan's
6	HEPs under Annexure D.	6	submission, duty-bound and consistent with the
7	So the key insight of the Kishenganga Court in this	7	principle of effectiveness in treaty interpretation
8	respect is that the Treaty, while not entirely	8	to select that interpretation that minimises the storage
9	anti-storage insofar as India's rights on the Western	9	available to India or India's physical ability to
10	Rivers are concerned, is certainly deeply suspicious	10	interfere with the flows into Pakistan.
11	of it.	11	So that's Article III: the essential framing for
12	To the extent that there is any yes, Mr Chairman.	12	Annexure D and, by extension, paragraph 8(c).
13	THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just so I can perhaps clarify	13	So with this framing set out, I'll take you now to
14	a little bit the interest at least I was expressing in	14	Annexure D. As we journey back to paragraph 8(c), we'll
15	Annexure E.	15	stop first as we must by paragraph 2, and consider
16	It wasn't so much pushing back on the idea that	16	some of the key definitions that construct that design
17	there are limits on storage in Annexure E; there clearly	17	criterion. We saw some of these yesterday, but I'll
18	are. It was more a question of: when one takes into	18	just give you a quick refresher now.
19	account Annexure E, and perhaps when one takes into	19	(Slide 19) So on the slide we've got our initial
20		20	series, and I've selected here the definitions that set
21	in Annexure D plants, is the differential in the pondage	21	various critical levels in an Annexure D.3 HEP's
22	that Pakistan is advancing in this proceeding versus	22	reservoir.
23		23	So paragraph 2(a), our first critical definition:
24		24	"Dead Storage" and the "Dead Storage Level".
25	risk that Pakistan perceives, given these other	25	Then we have paragraph 2(b), "Live Storage", which
	Page 25		Page 27
10:07 1	possibilities for storage?	10:09 1	means "all storage above Dead Storage" and the dead
10:07 1 2	possibilities for storage? That's really what at least I was trying to	10:09 1 2	means "all storage above Dead Storage" and the dead storage level.
2	That's really what at least I was trying to	2	storage level.
2 3	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at.	2 3	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the
2 3 4	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification.	2 3 4 5	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage
2 3 4 5	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed	2 3 4	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is:
2 3 4 5 6	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round.	2 3 4 5 6	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with
2 3 4 5 6 7	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question.	2 3 4 5 6 7	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage. I think that would be very useful, to take that into 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live storage reaches to the top of the dam wall; and then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage. I think that would be very useful, to take that into account and, for example, redo the exercise or the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live storage reaches to the top of the dam wall; and then intersecting the live storage zone, we have our full
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage. I think that would be very useful, to take that into account and, for example, redo the exercise or the simulation that Dr Morris presented, taking that potential storage or that allowance of storage into 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live storage reaches to the top of the dam wall; and then intersecting the live storage zone, we have our full pondage level; and then between that and the dead
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage. I think that would be very useful, to take that into account and, for example, redo the exercise or the simulation that Dr Morris presented, taking that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live storage reaches to the top of the dam wall; and then intersecting the live storage zone, we have our full pondage level; and then between that and the dead storage level, we've got the operating pool.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage. I think that would be very useful, to take that into account and, for example, redo the exercise or the simulation that Dr Morris presented, taking that potential storage or that allowance of storage into account in that exercise, just to make that more 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live storage reaches to the top of the dam wall; and then intersecting the live storage zone, we have our full pondage level; and then between that and the dead storage level, we've got the operating pool. (Slide 21) Now, what this doesn't do is tell you
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage. I think that would be very useful, to take that into account and, for example, redo the exercise or the simulation that Dr Morris presented, taking that potential storage or that allowance of storage into account in that exercise, just to make that more specific. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live storage reaches to the top of the dam wall; and then intersecting the live storage zone, we have our full pondage level; and then between that and the dead storage level, we've got the operating pool. (Slide 21) Now, what this doesn't do is tell you what the live storage is. And that's on this slide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage. I think that would be very useful, to take that into account and, for example, redo the exercise or the simulation that Dr Morris presented, taking that potential storage or that allowance of storage into account in that exercise, just to make that more specific. DR MILES: Thank you, Professor Buytaert. I hear pens 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live storage reaches to the top of the dam wall; and then intersecting the live storage zone, we have our full pondage level; and then between that and the dead storage level, we've got the operating pool. (Slide 21) Now, what this doesn't do is tell you what the live storage is. And that's on this slide. First of all, we have paragraph 2(g). Now, this
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage. I think that would be very useful, to take that into account and, for example, redo the exercise or the simulation that Dr Morris presented, taking that potential storage or that allowance of storage into account in that exercise, just to make that more specific. DR MILES: Thank you, Professor Buytaert. I hear pens furiously scribbling to my right. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live storage reaches to the top of the dam wall; and then intersecting the live storage zone, we have our full pondage level; and then between that and the dead storage level, we've got the operating pool. (Slide 21) Now, what this doesn't do is tell you what the live storage is. And that's on this slide. First of all, we have paragraph 2(g). Now, this defines the kind of HEP with which paragraph 8 is
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 That's really what at least I was trying to drive at. DR MILES: I see. Thank you for that clarification. I think that may have to await more developed submissions on Annexure E in the second round. Professor Buytaert has a question. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, just as a quick follow-up to the question of Mr Chairman. If you make that development, I think I would be particularly interested in putting that in the context of the values for storage that the Treaty permits under Annexure E at paragraph 7. There you have the table with values for both non-power and power storage. I think that would be very useful, to take that into account and, for example, redo the exercise or the simulation that Dr Morris presented, taking that potential storage or that allowance of storage into account in that exercise, just to make that more specific. DR MILES: Thank you, Professor Buytaert. I hear pens furiously scribbling to my right. Now, returning to paragraph 504. More to the point, 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 storage level. Then we've got paragraph 2(d), which deals with the "Full Pondage Level", which is: " the level corresponding to the maximum Pondage provided in the design in accordance with Paragraph 8(c)." And then we have paragraph 2(f), which is the "Operating Pool". That's: " the storage capacity between [the] Dead Storage level and [the] Full Pondage Level." (Slide 20) So back on the slide, we have again our cocktail napkin longitudinal profile. The dam wall is on the left of the slide, with the river flowing from right to left. And then we've got our various levels: dead storage level, dead storage beneath it; live storage reaches to the top of the dam wall; and then intersecting the live storage zone, we have our full pondage level; and then between that and the dead storage level, we've got the operating pool. (Slide 21) Now, what this doesn't do is tell you what the live storage is. And that's on this slide. First of all, we have paragraph 2(g). Now, this

10:10		10:13 1	plant". Is this significant or important, in your
	2 part of the plant, except for pondage and surcharge	2	interpretation?
	3 storage.	3	DR MILES: It's a very important question. The distinction
	4 So what are these? Well, we're given the answer in	4	is: a load on the system is the kind of thing done by
	5 paragraphs 2(c) and (e).	5	a load curve; the load on the plant is the portion of
	6 Paragraph 2(e) tells us what "Surcharge Storage" is,	6	that load curve that's been assigned by the system
	7 and that's:	7	
	8 " uncontrollable storage occupying space above	8	in the sense that the load on the plant will be part of
	9 the Full Pondage Level."	9	the overall load curve assigned to it by the operator.
	0 You'll recall we discussed this yesterday in	10	MR MINEAR: How will the designer know the load on the
1	1 relation to the HEP's freeboard. It is essentially	11	plant?
	2 where floodwater is temporarily stored until it can be	12	, 3
	3 evacuated through the spillway, preventing the dam from	13	
1	4 being overtopped. And the fact that it's uncontrolled	14	
1	5 is essential to prevent the HEP design from breaching	15	
1	6 paragraph 8(a), which we considered yesterday.	16	
	7 Then paragraph 2(c) tells us about "Pondage". And	17	
	8 this is:	18	
1	9 " Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude"	19	
4	0 Mark those words:	20	
4	" to meet fluctuations in the discharge of the	21	So the load on the plant is going to vary from day
2	turbines arising from variations in the daily and weekly	22	•
2	3 loads of the plant."	23	
	4 So the definition of "Pondage" refers to live	24	
4	storage that could potentially meet fluctuations in	25	criteria. So I just want to be clear that at the design
	Page 29		Page 31
10:12		10:14 1	stage, we will not know what the load on the plant will
- - -	2 weekly load.	2	be on a day-to-day basis, right?
	2 weekly load.3 Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the	2 3	be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c)
	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already 	2 3 4	be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that
	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is 	2 3 4 5	be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually
	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system 	2 3 4 5 6	be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case.
	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so 	2 3 4 5 6 7	be on a day-to-day basis, right?DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case.MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you.
	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore.
	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein.
1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and
1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of
1 1 1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as
1 1 1 1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily
1 1 1 1 1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design
1 1 1 1 1 1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately?
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may,
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could place an additional limitation on pondage. And that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may, Dr Blackmore. And once we've gone through the provision
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could place an additional limitation on pondage. And that additional limitation may mean that India does not have 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may, Dr Blackmore. And once we've gone through the provision in a little more detail, if I've not answered your
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could place an additional limitation on pondage. And that additional limitation may mean that India does not have sufficient pondage to meet its unilaterally determined 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may, Dr Blackmore. And once we've gone through the provision in a little more detail, if I've not answered your question, please ask it again and I'll do my best to
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could place an additional limitation on pondage. And that additional limitation may mean that India does not have sufficient pondage to meet its unilaterally determined HEP load. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may, Dr Blackmore. And once we've gone through the provision in a little more detail, if I've not answered your question, please ask it again and I'll do my best to answer it. It's a very good question. There's a few
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could place an additional limitation on pondage. And that additional limitation may mean that India does not have sufficient pondage to meet its unilaterally determined HEP load. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may, Dr Blackmore. And once we've gone through the provision in a little more detail, if I've not answered your question, please ask it again and I'll do my best to answer it. It's a very good question. There's a few more things I would like to unpack before we get to it,
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could place an additional limitation on pondage. And that additional limitation may mean that India does not have sufficient pondage to meet its unilaterally determined HEP load. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, could you address the significance of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may, Dr Blackmore. And once we've gone through the provision in a little more detail, if I've not answered your question, please ask it again and I'll do my best to answer it. It's a very good question. There's a few more things I would like to unpack before we get to it, if that's alright. Thank you.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could place an additional limitation on pondage. And that additional limitation may mean that India does not have sufficient pondage to meet its unilaterally determined HEP load. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, could you address the significance of the term "loads of the plant"? Previously we were 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may, Dr Blackmore. And once we've gone through the provision in a little more detail, if I've not answered your question, please ask it again and I'll do my best to answer it. It's a very good question. There's a few more things I would like to unpack before we get to it, if that's alright. Thank you. (Slide 22) Now, with all our relevant definitions in
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could place an additional limitation on pondage. And that additional limitation may mean that India does not have sufficient pondage to meet its unilaterally determined HEP load. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, could you address the significance of the term "loads of the plant"? Previously we were taking about load in terms of basically consumer 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may, Dr Blackmore. And once we've gone through the provision in a little more detail, if I've not answered your question, please ask it again and I'll do my best to answer it. It's a very good question. There's a few more things I would like to unpack before we get to it, if that's alright. Thank you. (Slide 22) Now, with all our relevant definitions in place, we can return to our longitudinal representation
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	 weekly load. Now, this is, to an extent, consistent with the usual understanding of pondage which we've already discussed. That load, as we've already seen, is determined by the power users. And the power system operator dispatches power from each generator so hydro, fossil fuel, solar, nuclear to continuously supply this load as it varies throughout the day. But the definition, critically, does not guarantee that the HEP will have live storage sufficient to meet the load so set. It provides, quite deliberately, that the live storage in any event will be of only sufficient magnitude to meet the load on the plant. Paragraph 2(c), therefore, does not preclude the possibility that another provision of Annexure D could place an additional limitation on pondage. And that additional limitation may mean that India does not have sufficient pondage to meet its unilaterally determined HEP load. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, could you address the significance of the term "loads of the plant"? Previously we were taking about load in terms of basically consumer 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 be on a day-to-day basis, right? DR MILES: That's entirely correct. And that's because 2(c) is not a design criterion, it's a definition. And that distinction I'm happy to pull it up is actually critical to Pakistan's case. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Just to follow in the same vein. This is the first time we've introduced daily and weekly loads. So where do they fit in, the selection of daily and the weekly loads? Are they to be seen as a criterion of some form together? Or are they, daily and weekly, to be seen as criteria or factors in design to be considered separately? DR MILES: I'm going to park that question, if I may, Dr Blackmore. And once we've gone through the provision in a little more detail, if I've not answered your question, please ask it again and I'll do my best to answer it. It's a very good question. There's a few more things I would like to unpack before we get to it, if that's alright. Thank you. (Slide 22) Now, with all our relevant definitions in

		I	
10.1.6	····	10.10 1	
10:16 1	We now have more complete information as pertains to	10:18 1	that India has the potential to make water not
2	live storage. We can see that surcharge storage lies	2	immediately available for Pakistan's use. In the worst
3	above the full pondage level and is considered	3	case, that means that the water so stored can be
4	uncontrollable. And pondage is stored in the operating	4	weaponised by India, either by withholding it as was
5	pool, reflecting the fact that it is controllable and to	5	done in April 1948 or by releasing it suddenly
6	be used for power production.	6	through low-level spillways designed to release the
7	Now and this is the important point if the	7	design flood. And Dr Morris gave you a taste of what
8	volume of the operating pool is increased, one of	8	that might look like yesterday.
9	two things could potentially happen.	9	Furthermore, if excessive live storage is multiplied
10	First, the full pondage level could be raised. As	10	across the multiple HEPs that India has planned for the
11	Mr Farooq noted, this may not be desirable, as it's	11	Western Rivers, the cumulative picture becomes very grim
12	going to entail a higher freeboard, and therefore a more	12	indeed.
13	expensive dam wall. So there's going to be a capital	13	(Slide 23) It's worth recalling what
14	expense.	14	Professor Briscoe of Harvard University, who worked on
15	Secondly, the dead storage level could be lowered.	15	both sides of the Line of Control, had to say about
16	Again, per Mr Farooq, in the ordinary course of events,	16	this, and we've got that on the slide (P-325):
17	this may not also be desirable. Dead storage is going	17	"Second, there is the permanent threat, which would
18	to be acting as a sediment trap, keeping the live	18	be a consequence of substantial cumulative live storage,
19	storage free from sediment even as the Treaty prohibits,	19	which could store about one month's worth of low-season
20	in express terms, its depletion. And the less dead	20	flow on the Chenab. If, God forbid, India so chose, it
21	storage you have, the smaller the trap, and the harder	21	could use this cumulative live storage to impose major
22	it will be to preserve live storage, absent active and	22	reductions on water availability in Pakistan during the
23	potentially expensive sediment management. So this	23	critical planting season."
24	represents an operational expense.	24	Professor Briscoe, however, was writing in 2010,
25	That's the conventional logic. And it's resolved	25	well before the full scale of India's plans became
	D 22		D 25
	Page 33		Page 35
10:17 1	via a kind of cost/benefit analysis of the type	10:20 1	known. If India were to realise its entire scheme of
2	I addressed you on at start of my presentation, dealing	2	HEP construction on the Western Rivers set out in
3	with a non-Treaty project.	3	chapter 5 to Pakistan's Memorial, the vision that
4	As Commissioner Shah observed in his evidence to you	4	Professor Briscoe charts would no longer be accurate:
5	on Day 2, however, India is given, under the Treaty,		
6		5	it would be considerably worse. And it's for that
	an additional and perhaps perverse incentive to maximise	5 6	it would be considerably worse. And it's for that reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the
7	an additional and perhaps perverse incentive to maximise its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating		•
7 8		6	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the
	its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating	6 7	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be
8	its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead	6 7 8	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed.
8 9 10 11	its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other	6 7 8 9	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry.
8 9 10 11 12	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning
8 9 10 11 12 13	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and
8 9 10 11 12	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest outlet, which can be substantially greater than the 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the concern of Pakistan's what I have to say are fairly
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest outlet, which can be substantially greater than the designated operating pool. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the concern of Pakistan's what I have to say are fairly speculative concerns about weaponisation?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest outlet, which can be substantially greater than the designated operating pool. So by lowering the dead storage level, India is 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the concern of Pakistan's what I have to say are fairly speculative concerns about weaponisation? DR MILES: I'd like to answer that question in three parts.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest outlet, which can be substantially greater than the designated operating pool. So by lowering the dead storage level, India is given greater control over the waters of the Western 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the concern of Pakistan's what I have to say are fairly speculative concerns about weaponisation? DR MILES: I'd like to answer that question in three parts. The first one is to say that in terms of balancing,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest outlet, which can be substantially greater than the designated operating pool. So by lowering the dead storage level, India is given greater control over the waters of the Western Rivers; water that, as the Court is aware, has been 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the concern of Pakistan's what I have to say are fairly speculative concerns about weaponisation? DR MILES: I'd like to answer that question in three parts. The first one is to say that in terms of balancing, the Treaty already tells you what the balance is going
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest outlet, which can be substantially greater than the designated operating pool. So by lowering the dead storage level, India is given greater control over the waters of the Western Rivers; water that, as the Court is aware, has been reserved by Article III(1) for Pakistan's exclusive use. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the concern of Pakistan's what I have to say are fairly speculative concerns about weaponisation? DR MILES: I'd like to answer that question in three parts. The first one is to say that in terms of balancing, the Treaty already tells you what the balance is going to be. And it does that through Article III, the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest outlet, which can be substantially greater than the designated operating pool. So by lowering the dead storage level, India is given greater control over the waters of the Western Rivers; water that, as the Court is aware, has been reserved by Article III(1) for Pakistan's exclusive use. By equal measure, any additional control of such 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the concern of Pakistan's what I have to say are fairly speculative concerns about weaponisation? DR MILES: I'd like to answer that question in three parts. The first one is to say that in terms of balancing, the Treaty already tells you what the balance is going to be. And it does that through Article III, the rule-exception structure.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest outlet, which can be substantially greater than the designated operating pool. So by lowering the dead storage level, India is given greater control over the waters of the Western Rivers; water that, as the Court is aware, has been reserved by Article III(1) for Pakistan's exclusive use. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the concern of Pakistan's what I have to say are fairly speculative concerns about weaponisation? DR MILES: I'd like to answer that question in three parts. The first one is to say that in terms of balancing, the Treaty already tells you what the balance is going to be. And it does that through Article III, the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 its pondage, and therefore the size of the operating pool, which is to push the dead storage level lower in the reservoir. And as Professor Webb has shown, a lower dead storage level will drive India to situate various other important HEP components outlets, spillways and power intakes lower in the reservoir. And although the normal operational volume lies above the dead storage level, the physically controllable volume controllable storage, which Dr Morris was addressing you on is that which lies above the bottom of the lowest outlet, which can be substantially greater than the designated operating pool. So by lowering the dead storage level, India is given greater control over the waters of the Western Rivers; water that, as the Court is aware, has been reserved by Article III(1) for Pakistan's exclusive use. By equal measure, any additional control of such 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reason that Pakistan says that the provision for the calculation of maximum pondage in paragraph 8(c) must be taken very seriously indeed. Yes, Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. DR MILES: Oh, sorry. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, there's another aspect concerning pondage, separate from Pakistan's apprehensions, and that's India's interest in optimal operation of its reservoirs and its HEPs. Obviously having additional live storage gives them greater flexibility. Now, how do we balance that concern against the concern of Pakistan's what I have to say are fairly speculative concerns about weaponisation? DR MILES: I'd like to answer that question in three parts. The first one is to say that in terms of balancing, the Treaty already tells you what the balance is going to be. And it does that through Article III, the rule-exception structure.

10:21 1	which we're going to come on to, when it says that	10:24 1	the Treaty, the operating pool to be the same volume as
2	India's ability to have pondage is not predicated on its	2	pondage?
3	ability to optimise its operating pool or its reservoir	3	DR MILES: You can indeed.
4	function. It's predicated on a very specific criterion,	4	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.
5	which is the pondage required for firm power. So in	5	DR MILES: (Slide 24) Before we come on to paragraph 8(c)
6	Pakistan's submission, that balancing act has already	6	directly, there is another provision to consider, which
7	been done by Treaty.	7	is the rather densely worded paragraph 15.
8	But as to the third point I wanted to make, which is	8	As the Court will appreciate, paragraph 15 is not
9	regarding speculation as to what these concerns are, the	9	an ex facie criterion of Annexure D.3 HEP design: it's
10		10	not contained in paragraph 8. And by purpose and
10	vivendi of the Treaty so far as Pakistan was concerned.	10	effects, it sets the limit of a HEP's operation.
11	I mean, its entire negotiating position was formulated	11	Now, the chapeau of the provision, together with
	off the back of 1948, or what it appreciated had		paragraphs 15(i) and 15(ii), defines the limit of the
13		13	
14		14	HEP's daily operation, whether in terms of a single day
15	Pakistan to come to the table and negotiate the very	15	or a seven-day period. These limit, in terms of the
16	strict limits that we see in Article III and in	16	percentage of river inflow, the amount of water that
17	paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D.	17	India is permitted to store and discharge from the
18	MR MINEAR: I think that all might be true. But our friends	18	operating pool of an Annexure D.3 HEP. And that's based
19	from India are not here, and I think they would say that	19	on the location of the HEP on the Western Rivers.
20	on their side of the negotiation table, they were	20	So in terms of seven-day operations, the schedule is
21	concerned about developing hydropower, and they ensured	21	the same for every plant, and it's set by clause (a) of
22	that in the preamble there was the point of optimal use	22	the chapeau:
23	of the resources.	23	" the volume of water received in the river
24	So I just want to say that, in my mind, this is	24	upstream of the Plant, during any period of seven
25	a significant concern with regard to how we view maximum	25	consecutive days, shall be delivered into the river
	Page 37		Page 39
10:23 1	pondage. And I just want to make sure you understand	10:25 1	below the Plant during that same seven-day period"
10:23 1 2	pondage. And I just want to make sure you understand that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as	10:25 1 2	below the Plant during that same seven-day period" In short, all water that enters the reservoir in
2	that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well.DR MILES: That is understood.	2	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in
2 3	that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well.DR MILES: That is understood.But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean,	2 3	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period.
2 3 4	that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well.DR MILES: That is understood.	2 3 4	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other
2 3 4 5	that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well.DR MILES: That is understood.But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean,	2 3 4 5	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period.
2 3 4 5 6	that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well.DR MILES: That is understood.But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends;	2 3 4 5 6	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the
2 3 4 5 6 7	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it 	2 3 4 5 6 7	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. MR MINEAR: And I just make the point that I think that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that 24-hour period or discharge not more than 130% of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. MR MINEAR: And I just make the point that I think that India has a different view of that, of which we need to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that 24-hour period or discharge not more than 130% of the same.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. MR MINEAR: And I just make the point that I think that India has a different view of that, of which we need to be cognisant. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that 24-hour period or discharge not more than 130% of the same. And in certain circumstances, the periods differ.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. MR MINEAR: And I just make the point that I think that India has a different view of that, of which we need to be cognisant. DR MILES: Quite understood. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that 24-hour period or discharge not more than 130% of the same. And in certain circumstances, the periods differ. So per paragraph 15(i), if the HEP is on the Chenab
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. MR MINEAR: And I just make the point that I think that India has a different view of that, of which we need to be cognisant. DR MILES: Quite understood. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that 24-hour period or discharge not more than 130% of the same. And in certain circumstances, the periods differ. So per paragraph 15(i), if the HEP is on the Chenab below Ramban, all water received into the reservoir in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. MR MINEAR: And I just make the point that I think that India has a different view of that, of which we need to be cognisant. DR MILES: Quite understood. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, before we move on, can 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that 24-hour period or discharge not more than 130% of the same. And in certain circumstances, the periods differ. So per paragraph 15(i), if the HEP is on the Chenab below Ramban, all water received into the reservoir in a 24-hour period must be discharged within that same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 that we're sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. MR MINEAR: And I just make the point that I think that India has a different view of that, of which we need to be cognisant. DR MILES: Quite understood. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, before we move on, can I quickly go back to the previous slide (22), and ask 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that 24-hour period or discharge not more than 130% of the same. And in certain circumstances, the periods differ. So per paragraph 15(i), if the HEP is on the Chenab below Ramban, all water received into the reservoir in a 24-hour period. And per paragraph 15(ii), where the HEP
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 sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. MR MINEAR: And I just make the point that I think that India has a different view of that, of which we need to be cognisant. DR MILES: Quite understood. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, before we move on, can I quickly go back to the previous slide (22), and ask for a clarification here. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that 24-hour period or discharge not more than 130% of the same. And in certain circumstances, the periods differ. So per paragraph 15(i), if the HEP is on the Chenab below Ramban, all water received into the reservoir in a 24-hour period. And per paragraph 15(ii), where the HEP is located on the Chenab above Ramban, India can retain
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 sensitive to India's concerns on this as well. DR MILES: That is understood. But insofar as the preamble is concerned I mean, we're well aware of the concerns of our Indian friends; it's a shame that they can't be here to express it themselves the optimum utilisation of the waters of the Indus Rivers was achieved through the division. And division of the waters in the Eastern and Western Rivers gave the Western Rivers to Pakistan, subject again to very limited exceptions for Indian use. So I just wanted to place that point on the record. But I appreciate that India's concerns are very well recognised by this Court. MR MINEAR: And I just make the point that I think that India has a different view of that, of which we need to be cognisant. DR MILES: Quite understood. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, before we move on, can I quickly go back to the previous slide (22), and ask for a clarification here. You mention here "Operating Pool/Pondage". Does 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	In short, all water that enters the reservoir in a given seven-day period must be passed through the HEP, whether through the turbines or spillways or any other method, within the same seven-day period. And paragraph 16, also on the slide, sets the seven-day period as running from 8.00 am Saturday to 7.59 am the following Saturday. In terms of daily operations, the storage and discharge schedule becomes a little bit more complicated. And that's the element that depends on location. The default schedule, per clause (b) of the chapeau, is that in any given 24-hour period, India can either retain not more than 70% of the river inflow during that 24-hour period or discharge not more than 130% of the same. And in certain circumstances, the periods differ. So per paragraph 15(i), if the HEP is on the Chenab below Ramban, all water received into the reservoir in a 24-hour period. And per paragraph 15(ii), where the HEP is located on the Chenab above Ramban, India can retain no more than 50% of the flow of the river, and discharge

10:27 1	Again, paragraph 16 sets the 24-hour schedule as	10:29 1	the operating pool "shall not exceed twice the Pondage
2		2	required for Firm Power".
3		3	Now, this in turn prompts the question: how much
4		4	pondage is required for firm power? And that's really
5		5	the nub of the problem so far as paragraph 8(c) is
		6	concerned. And before we can answer it, I'm afraid we
6 7	-	0 7	have to go to another critical term in paragraph 8(c),
		8	which is the definition of "Firm Power" provided in
8	-		-
9		9	paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D.
10		10	THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, before you do that, would it be
11		11	correct to say that India's emphasis in this regard for
12		12	calculation of pondage places a lot of weight on that
13	*	13	defined term of "Pondage", and uses the definition for
14	•	14	purposes of saying: we need to look at the load, basically of the plant to determine pondage
15		15 16	
16			DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: whereas your argument here, as you're
17	*	17 18	
18		18	about to unfold, is: that's merely a definition telling
19			us what "Pondage" means, and this language here, your emphasis on the second half of the sentence, is what
20 21		20 21	should drive the calculation? Is that correct?
21		21	DR MILES: That's correct, sir.
22		22	MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, can I add just in terms of your
23		23 24	elaboration on this.
25	-	24	I sense that one of the principal differences
2.		25	
	Page 41		Page 43
10:28 1	operational parameters of paragraph 15 into the design	10:31 1	between India and Pakistan is what we mean by "required
10:28 1	operational parameters of paragraph 15 into the design parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate	10:31 1	between India and Pakistan is what we mean by "required for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different
10:28 1 2 3	parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate	10:31 1 2 3	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different
2		2	
2 3	parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather	2 3	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your
2 3 4	parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it.	2 3 4	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences
2 3 4 5	parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but,	2 3 4 5	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is.
2 3 4 5 6	parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let	2 3 4 5 6	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the 	2 3 4 5 6 7	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that the maximum pondage in the operating pool is somehow set 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts. Now, in its chapeau, paragraph 2(i) provides that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that the maximum pondage in the operating pool is somehow set by the definition of "Pondage" in paragraph 2(c): 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts. Now, in its chapeau, paragraph 2(i) provides that, ""Firm Power' means the hydro-electric power
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that the maximum pondage in the operating pool is somehow set by the definition of "Pondage" in paragraph 2(c): 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts. Now, in its chapeau, paragraph 2(i) provides that, "Firm Power' means the hydro-electric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge at the site
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that the maximum pondage in the operating pool is somehow set by the definition of "Pondage" in paragraph 2(c): 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts. Now, in its chapeau, paragraph 2(i) provides that, "'Firm Power' means the hydro-electric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant", and then follows a detailed formula for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that the maximum pondage in the operating pool is somehow set by the definition of "Pondage" in paragraph 2(c): "Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude", variations in load, et cetera. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts. Now, in its chapeau, paragraph 2(i) provides that, "Firm Power' means the hydro-electric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant", and then follows a detailed formula for the calculation of the minimum mean discharge, or "MMD", as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that the maximum pondage in the operating pool is somehow set by the definition of "Pondage" in paragraph 2(c): "Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude", variations in load, et cetera. But we see immediately that paragraph 8(c) has another ideas for us. The second and, as a matter of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts. Now, in its chapeau, paragraph 2(i) provides that, "Firm Power' means the hydro-electric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant", and then follows a detailed formula for the calculation of the minimum mean discharge, or "MMD", as it's invariably called.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that the maximum pondage in the operating pool is somehow set by the definition of "Pondage" in paragraph 2(c): "Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude", variations in load, et cetera. But we see immediately that paragraph 8(c) has another ideas for us. The second and, as a matter of language, controlling element of this provision imposes 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts. Now, in its chapeau, paragraph 2(i) provides that, ""Firm Power' means the hydro-electric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant", and then follows a detailed formula for the calculation of the minimum mean discharge, or "MMD", as it's invariably called. Yes, Mr Minear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that the maximum pondage in the operating pool is somehow set by the definition of "Pondage" in paragraph 2(c): "Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude", variations in load, et cetera. But we see immediately that paragraph 8(c) has another ideas for us. The second and, as a matter of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts. Now, in its chapeau, paragraph 2(i) provides that, "Firm Power' means the hydro-electric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant", and then follows a detailed formula for the calculation of the minimum mean discharge, or "MMD", as it's invariably called.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 parameters in paragraph 8 would not be a legitimate interpretation of the Treaty, but rather an impermissible rewriting of it. So with apologies for that slightly circuitous but, I hope the Court will agree, necessary introduction, let us now return to paragraph 8(c), which sets out the Treaty's approach to the calculation of maximum pondage, and thus provides the parties with direction on how to fix the size of the operating pool. (Slide 25) So for the third time, we can see paragraph 8(c) on the slide, and we're now in a position to start breaking this down a little bit. Let's start with the opening stanza: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool" Now, if we just take those two terms together, "Pondage" and "Operating Pool", we might well think that the maximum pondage in the operating pool is somehow set by the definition of "Pondage" in paragraph 2(c): "Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude", variations in load, et cetera. But we see immediately that paragraph 8(c) has another ideas for us. The second and, as a matter of language, controlling element of this provision imposes 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	for Firm Power". I think India takes a quite different view than Pakistan does. So in the course of your presentation, I hope you can highlight the differences and why Pakistan's argument is such as it is. DR MILES: I absolutely will, sir. (Slide 26) So paragraph 2(i) is now on the slide. The first part of this is crucial. It establishes a special meaning for "Firm Power" within the Treaty. Now, per VCLT Article 31(4), a special meaning shall be given to any term of a treaty if it can be established that the parties so intended. And by paragraph 2(i), the parties to the Treaty indicated unequivocally that they so intended, and that paragraph 2(i) will provide the definition of "Firm Power" for the treaty, irrespective of how that term might be used in other contexts. Now, in its chapeau, paragraph 2(i) provides that, "'Firm Power' means the hydro-electric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant", and then follows a detailed formula for the calculation of the minimum mean discharge, or "MMD", as it's invariably called. Yes, Mr Minear.

10:32 1	I think it's best I raise these things as they come up.	10:34 1	produce the 25 year average flow for each of our 10-day
2	With regard to firm power, maybe this is in some	2	periods. So we've got, ultimately, a series of
3	ways one of the easier and one of the harder issues that	3	36 averages, each measuring river flow in cubic metres
4	we have. With regard to the easy part of it, I think	4	per second. And the lowest of those 36 averages is then
5	that India and Pakistan agree on the measurement of	5	selected as the MMD. And that's invariably going to be
6	minimum mean discharge.	6	one of the 10-day periods in the middle of the dry
7	DR MILES: They do.	7	season: maybe January or February.
8	MR MINEAR: There's no dispute on that.	8	That perhaps sounds a little bit more complicated
9	On the other hand, I think that they take different	9	than it actually is. And to explain a little better,
10	views on the significance of the terminology of "Firm	9 10	Pakistan has included in its Memorial a real-life
10	Power". As I understand from Professor Webb before	10	example based on the 25 years of daily flow data that
11	I raised the question: are there any vestiges of the	11	India has provided with respect to its proposed Kiru HEP
12	ordinary meaning of "Firm Power" that carry into the	12	on the Chenab. Because under Appendix II of Annexure D,
	defined term? And she told me that in international law	13	this is part of the information that India is required
14 15		14	to hand over when they notify Pakistan of a new plant
15	practice, there is not. But I sense that India does see those vestiges in the way that it constructs its	15	under paragraph 9 of Annexure D.
10		10	Now, that data is set out at Appendix E1 of the
17	arguments.	17	
18	So again, I'm highlighting what I think will be the differences that I will raise as we continue to go on.	18	Memorial. And after we sort of work through the various
	DR MILES: I don't think there are any differences between		calculations, it provides an MMD of 65.3 cubic metres a second for the Kiru HEP, and that arises from the
20	-	20	
21	the parties as to what this provision means in terms of	21	10-day period for 11 to 20 February.
22	what is the "Firm Power".	22	MR MINEAR: I apologise again for the interruption.
23	MR MINEAR: Yes.	23 24	I believe that you included in I believe it's Exhibit P-546 the information that India provided with
24	DR MILES: The question becomes, over time: what role does	24 25	-
25	"Firm Power" play in paragraph 8(c)? And in Pakistan's	23	respect to the Kiru plant. In that document, it did not
	Page 45		Page 47
10:33 1	submission, it's completely central and indeed the	10:36 1	include Appendix 7, and Appendix 7 was their calculation
2	raison d'être of the provision. And India takes	2	for pondage for that.
2 3	raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's	2 3	for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see.
2 3 4	raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment.	2 3 4	for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due
2 3	raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you.	2 3	for pondage for that.DR MILES: I see.MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course.
2 3 4 5 6	raison d'être of the provision. And India takesa slightly different view, but we'll come on to India'sposition in a moment.MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you.DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the	2 3 4 5 6	for pondage for that.DR MILES: I see.MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course.DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank
2 3 4 5 6 7	raison d'être of the provision. And India takesa slightly different view, but we'll come on to India'sposition in a moment.MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you.DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on theMMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's	2 3 4 5 6 7	for pondage for that.DR MILES: I see.MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course.DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for pondage for that.DR MILES: I see.MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course.DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you.MR MINEAR: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for pondage for that.DR MILES: I see.MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course.DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you.MR MINEAR: Thank you.DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not small HEP. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it does not correspond to the lowest flow rate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not small HEP. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it does not correspond to the lowest historical flow rate in any recorded year. It reflects a single rate, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not small HEP. Each year of the record is then broken into defined 10-day periods and the average flow, measured in [cubic] 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it does not correspond to the lowest flow rate in any recorded year. It reflects a single rate, in cubic metres per second, that will be reasonably assured
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not small HEP. Each year of the record is then broken into defined 10-day periods and the average flow, measured in [cubic] metres a second, is calculated over each 10-day period. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it does not correspond to the lowest flow rate in any recorded year. It reflects a single rate, in cubic metres per second, that will be reasonably assured throughout any given year. And from this it follows
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not small HEP. Each year of the record is then broken into defined 10-day periods and the average flow, measured in [cubic] metres a second, is calculated over each 10-day period. So following this process, we're going to have 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it does not correspond to the lowest flow rate in any recorded year. It reflects a single rate, in cubic metres per second, that will be reasonably assured throughout any given year. And from this it follows that India can expect in a year that the flow in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not small HEP. Each year of the record is then broken into defined 10-day periods and the average flow, measured in [cubic] metres a second, is calculated over each 10-day period. So following this process, we're going to have 36 periods of 10 days for any given year. And for our 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it does not correspond to the lowest flow rate in any recorded year. It reflects a single rate, in cubic metres per second, that will be reasonably assured throughout any given year. And from this it follows that India can expect in a year that the flow in question will drop below the MMD at some point in time:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not small HEP. Each year of the record is then broken into defined 10-day periods and the average flow, measured in [cubic] metres a second, is calculated over each 10-day period. So following this process, we're going to have 36 periods of 10 days for any given year. And for our 25-year record, the values of those 10-day periods will 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it does not correspond to the lowest flow rate in any recorded year. It reflects a single rate, in cubic metres per second, that will be reasonably assured throughout any given year. And from this it follows that India can expect in a year that the flow in question will drop below the MMD at some point in time: perhaps for a few hours, perhaps for a few days, perhaps
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not small HEP. Each year of the record is then broken into defined 10-day periods and the average flow, measured in [cubic] metres a second, is calculated over each 10-day period. So following this process, we're going to have 36 periods of 10 days for any given year. And for our 25-year record, the values of those 10-day periods will 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it does not correspond to the lowest flow rate in any recorded year. It reflects a single rate, in cubic metres per second, that will be reasonably assured throughout any given year. And from this it follows that India can expect in a year that the flow in question will drop below the MMD at some point in time: perhaps for a few hours, perhaps for a few days, perhaps for longer in a very dry year.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 raison d'être of the provision. And India takes a slightly different view, but we'll come on to India's position in a moment. MR MINEAR: Very well. Thank you. DR MILES: Now, I'll address you only very briefly on the MMD formula. As I just answered to Mr Minear, it's agreed between the parties, and provokes controversy only if the data underpinning it is questioned. We consider it in a little more detail at paragraphs 11.45 to 11.49 of the Memorial. But for present purposes, however, the formula requires the parties to examine the record of historical daily flows at the site of the proposed Annexure D.3 HEP for as long as data are available, but limited to 25 years when dealing with an ordinary i.e. not small HEP. Each year of the record is then broken into defined 10-day periods and the average flow, measured in [cubic] metres a second, is calculated over each 10-day period. So following this process, we're going to have 36 periods of 10 days for any given year. And for our 25-year record, the values of those 10-day periods will then be averaged out across the historical record. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 for pondage for that. DR MILES: I see. MR MINEAR: I wonder if that could be provided to us in due course. DR MILES: We'll certainly make sure that happens. Thank you. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: So 11 to 20 February. An important caveat before we move on. As I've just explained, the MMD is an average figure, expressed in cubic metres per second, and it's an average figure produced from a potentially substantial historical record. So the MMD does not correspond to the lowest flow rate at the site of a proposed HEP in any given year; it does not correspond to the lowest flow rate in any recorded year. It reflects a single rate, in cubic metres per second, that will be reasonably assured throughout any given year. And from this it follows that India can expect in a year that the flow in question will drop below the MMD at some point in time: perhaps for a few hours, perhaps for a few days, perhaps

10:37 1	formula in paragraph 2(i) is to produce a respectably	10:40 1	HEP is 57.65 MW, which is the power that its turbines
2	low rate of flow that has been calculated in such a way	2	can produce when the Chenab is flowing at the MMD of
3	as to iron out daily, weekly and annual aberrations.	3	65.3 cubic metres a second. For the Kiru HEP,
4	It's not predicated on some kind of a worst case	4	therefore, the pondage required for firm power is the
5	scenario, "How low can you go?" kind of analysis. The	5	pondage required for that HEP's turbines to produce
6	result is a figure that reflects a characteristically	6	57.65 MW.
0 7	low flow rate in the river at the location in question,	0 7	Now, stepping back from that for a second; it's
8	typically occurring near the middle of the dry season.	8	a bit of technical detail. But ultimately, within this
	This makes abundant good sense when we contrast	9	calculation, the only number that matters from the point
9 10	"Firm Power" under the Treaty with another concept,	9 10	of view of pondage is the MMD, because that's your flow
11	which is that of "Secondary Power". And that definition	11 12	rate. Pondage is live storage, and live storage can
12 13	is at paragraph 2(j), also on the slide. This provides	12	only be filled by the flow of a river at a particular
	that:		point in time. And the only figure in this equation
14	"'Secondary Power' means the power, other than Firm	14	that's derived from that flow is the MMD. If one were
15	Power, available only during certain periods of the	15	to, for example, reduce the assumed generating head of the HEP from 100 metres to 50 metres, the firm power
16 17	year."	16	
17	What this tells is that, under Annexure D, the HEP	17	would be halved; but the MMD, and therefore the pondage
18	should be capable of firm power throughout the year, but	18	derived therefrom, would remain the same.
19 20	that secondary power is not expected to be available	19 20	So for the purposes of calculating firm power, the
20	continuously.	20	MMD is the only relevant component. And that's why the
21	And also secondary power is variable. During the	21	Kishenganga Court said, in the passage we looked at
22	dry season, it may only be marginally greater than firm	22	earlier (PLA-3, paragraph 504):
23	power. But in the summer wet season, when water is	23	" Annexure D likewise restricts the permissible
24	plentiful, secondary power will be much greater than	24	volume of pondage, and pegs this limit to power
25	firm power; and during some months, equal to the	25	generation at the minimum mean discharge calculated at
	Page 49		Page 51
10.39 1	installed capacity of the plant	10.42 1	the site "
10:39 1	installed capacity of the plant. So that's the MMD But what does paragraph 2(i)	10:42 1	the site." Before moving on I've got one final point that
2	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i)	2	Before moving on, I've got one final point that
2 3	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power	2 3	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated.
2 3 4	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"?	2 3 4	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something
2 3 4 5	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward.	2 3 4 5	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading
2 3 4 5 6	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from	2 3 4 5 6	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter,
2 3 4 5 6 7	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating	2 3 4 5 6 7	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm
2 3 4 5 6	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from	2 3 4 5 6	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the HEP's turbine and generator in converting the energy of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic definitions of these two concepts, which were taken from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the HEP's turbine and generator in converting the energy of falling water into electrical energy. Most modern HEPs	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic definitions of these two concepts, which were taken from the US Army Corps of Engineers' Hydropower Manual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the HEP's turbine and generator in converting the energy of falling water into electrical energy. Most modern HEPs are very efficient and convert about 90% of the energy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic definitions of these two concepts, which were taken from the US Army Corps of Engineers' Hydropower Manual (P-302). First, we have the definition of "energy",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the HEP's turbine and generator in converting the energy of falling water into electrical energy. Most modern HEPs are very efficient and convert about 90% of the energy of falling water into electrical energy. And if you	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic definitions of these two concepts, which were taken from the US Army Corps of Engineers' Hydropower Manual (P-302). First, we have the definition of "energy", which is "that which is capable of doing work". And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the HEP's turbine and generator in converting the energy of falling water into electrical energy. Most modern HEPs are very efficient and convert about 90% of the energy of falling water into electrical energy. And if you divide the watts figure so obtained by 1 million, you get megawatts. (Slide 28) Again, on the slide we see an example of	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic definitions of these two concepts, which were taken from the US Army Corps of Engineers' Hydropower Manual (P-302). First, we have the definition of "energy", which is "that which is capable of doing work". And second, we have the definition of "power", which is "the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the HEP's turbine and generator in converting the energy of falling water into electrical energy. Most modern HEPs are very efficient and convert about 90% of the energy of falling water into electrical energy. And if you divide the watts figure so obtained by 1 million, you get megawatts.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic definitions of these two concepts, which were taken from the US Army Corps of Engineers' Hydropower Manual (P-302). First, we have the definition of "energy", which is "that which is capable of doing work". And second, we have the definition of "power", which is "the rate at which energy is produced or used".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the HEP's turbine and generator in converting the energy of falling water into electrical energy. Most modern HEPs are very efficient and convert about 90% of the energy of falling water into electrical energy. And if you divide the watts figure so obtained by 1 million, you get megawatts. (Slide 28) Again, on the slide we see an example of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic definitions of these two concepts, which were taken from the US Army Corps of Engineers' Hydropower Manual (P-302). First, we have the definition of "energy", which is "that which is capable of doing work". And second, we have the definition of "power", which is "the rate at which energy is produced or used". So as we've seen, "Firm Power" is the power,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the HEP's turbine and generator in converting the energy of falling water into electrical energy. Most modern HEPs are very efficient and convert about 90% of the energy of falling water into electrical energy. And if you divide the watts figure so obtained by 1 million, you get megawatts. (Slide 28) Again, on the slide we see an example of this, and we've taken that from data provided by the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic definitions of these two concepts, which were taken from the US Army Corps of Engineers' Hydropower Manual (P-302). First, we have the definition of "energy", which is "that which is capable of doing work". And second, we have the definition of "power", which is "the rate at which energy is produced or used". So as we've seen, "Firm Power" is the power, measured in megawatts, that the turbines of a HEP can
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	So that's the MMD. But what does paragraph 2(i) mean when it refers to "the hydro-electric power corresponding to the [MMD]"? (Slide 27) Happily, this is again straightforward. You will recall once more Mr Khan's presentation from the site visit on the standard formula for calculating the hydroelectric power that can be derived from a particular river flow, whereby power, in watts, is the product of a particular river flow in cubic metres a second, multiplied by generating head, in metres, multiplied by the density of water, in kilograms per metre cubed, which is almost 1,000, multiplied by the force of gravity, in metres per second per second, which is always 9.81, multiplied by the efficiency of the HEP's turbine and generator in converting the energy of falling water into electrical energy. Most modern HEPs are very efficient and convert about 90% of the energy of falling water into electrical energy. And if you divide the watts figure so obtained by 1 million, you get megawatts. (Slide 28) Again, on the slide we see an example of this, and we've taken that from data provided by the Kiru HEP. Assuming a generating head of 100 metres and	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 Before moving on, I've got one final point that needs to be ventilated. When we discussed firm power, there is something which is not necessarily obvious from reading paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D or, for that matter, paragraph 8(c), and that's the distinction between firm power and firm energy. Now, the distinction between power and energy is well understood by anyone who has taken a high-school physics course. I didn't take high-school physics, so this was all quite new to me when I started looking into it. But as I say, it's of key importance for present purposes. (Slide 29) On the slide, we've got the basic definitions of these two concepts, which were taken from the US Army Corps of Engineers' Hydropower Manual (P-302). First, we have the definition of "energy", which is "that which is capable of doing work". And second, we have the definition of "power", which is "the rate at which energy is produced or used". So as we've seen, "Firm Power" is the power, measured in megawatts, that the turbines of a HEP can instantaneously produce when the river on which it is

10:43 1	then diverted into the turbines. And that's different	10:45 1	Yes, Mr Chair.
2	from "Firm Energy", which refers to power production	2	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.
3	over a defined period of time, be it a minute, an hour	3	DR MILES: Ah, yes.
4	or 24 hours. And for hydropower, energy is typically	4	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Sorry to interrupt.
5	measured as megawatts of power sustained for an hour,	5	But you mentioned several times the word
6	which is a megawatt hour.	6	"instantaneous". Obviously power is expressed is
7	THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, I think Mr Minear has a question.	7	a flux, clearly, which varies over time and has
8	MR MINEAR: Sorry. Just to clarify this point in my mind.	8	a maximum of a certain duration. But it's also quite
9	Is it fair to say that the water that is stored	9	commonly referred to as an average over a certain time
10	that the pondage represents energy that's available to	10	period.
10	produce the power which is related to the flow?	11	What's your take on the significance of
12	DR MILES: Yes.	12	"instantaneous" in this context?
12	MR MINEAR: Is that fair?	12	DR MILES: In this context, we merely refer to
13	DR MILES: Yes.	13	"instantaneous" to say that when the flow is going
14	MR MINEAR: Thank you.	15	through the turbines at the MMD rate, the amount of
15	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.	16	power that's produced is going to be firm power in that
10	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Dr Miles.	10	context. So it's not about an averaging amount of time
18	You mentioned the concept of "Firm Energy".	18	or anything like that; it's what's coming out of the HEP
10	DR MILES: Yes.	19	when the minimum mean discharge is flowing through the
20	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Obviously the definitions that you	20	turbines.
20	present here are more generally about energy and power.	20	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.
22	How common is the concept of "firm energy" in the	21	DR MILES: So what India is guaranteed by paragraph 8(c),
23	concept of hydroelectric plants?	23	therefore, is pondage that will allow its HEP to achieve
23 24	DR MILES: Speaking under the control of my engineering	23	a particular instantaneous rate of power production, and
25	colleagues, it is fairly common as a general concept,	25	nothing more. If it purported to guarantee India firm
20	conceguos, n'is fairly common as a general concept,	25	nouning more. If it purported to guarantee man min
	Page 53		Page 55
10:44 1	"fine"	1	
	"firm energy". PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.	1 2	power for any particular duration per day or per week, it would no longer be reflecting firm power: it would be
23	DR MILES: "Firm power" refers to the instantaneous rate of	3	reflecting firm energy. And that would be a basic
4	energy production. I think the next slide (30) might	4	category error.
5	actually answer your question.	5	(Slide 30) Without wishing to show the knife hidden
6	"Firm power" thereby refers to the instantaneous	6	in the napkin too much, the extract on this slide rather
7	rate of energy production, while "firm energy" refers to	7	indicates that India has made precisely that kind of
8	the cumulative amount of power produced over a specified	8	error. This is an extract from India's counter-memorial
9	period of time.	9	in Baglihar (BR-8). What do we see there?
10	Paragraph 8(c) on its face, therefore, guarantees	10	
11	India only a HEP capable of attaining a particular	11	energy that would be available to meet the energy
12	instantaneous rate of production pegged not to the HEP's	12	component of power demand on all the days throughout the
13	installed capacity, but to a particular instantaneous	13	year. Being a Run-of-River Plant with weekly Pondage,
14		14	
15		15	the system"
16		16	-
17		17	power" into "firm energy", and totally changes the
18	-	18	meaning of paragraph 2(i). None of this stuff is said
19		19	anywhere in there: it's all a fiction of India's own
	terms of guaranteed hours of energy production. If it	1)	any where in allerer its an a netion of manab own
20	terms of guaranteed hours of energy production. If it did, paragraph 2(i) wouldn't be talking about "Firm	20	devising.
20 21			
	did, paragraph 2(i) wouldn't be talking about "Firm Power"; it would be talking about "Firm Energy".	20	devising.
21	did, paragraph 2(i) wouldn't be talking about "Firm Power"; it would be talking about "Firm Energy".	20 21	devising. Now, we'll get on to this in due course,

25 production per week -- rather, not even firm power

Page 56

25

production, and nothing more.

Page 54

10:48 1	production, just general production as part of its	10:50 1	of pondage will require a careful act of Treaty
2	pondage calculation. And in so doing, it does not seek	2	interpretation, which this Court is well composed to
3	the pondage required for firm power; it seeks the	3	carry out.
4	pondage required for firm energy. And that firm energy	4	(Slide 32) Now, to aid the Court in resolving this
5	is more than that produced by the MMD, invariably: it	5	question, Pakistan has developed a series of six
6	can be up to the plant's installed capacity, according	6	sufficiency criteria drawn from the Treaty's guiding
7	to India.	7	principles; truths held, we might say, to be
8	Now, that's just one of many errors in India's	8	self-evident. You can find these set out in the
9	approach, in Pakistan's submission, and we'll get back	9	Memorial at paragraph 11.43, and Pakistan commends them
10	to that in due course. But in the meantime, we're still	10	to the Court as a useful yardstick against which to
10	left with our question.	10	measure any potential methodology for the calculation of
11	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear.	11	maximum pondage. If a particular interpretation of
12	MR MINEAR: Before you pose that question, would it be fair	12	paragraph 8(c) fails to meet any of these criteria,
13	to say that the pondage itself represents firm energy?	13	then at least in Pakistan's submission this would
15	DR MILES: It represents energy, but I wouldn't say it was	15	be a strong indication that the interpretation was
15	firm energy, because firm energy is a concept that's	15	incorrect, and that the interpreter should reconsider
10	linked to demand, so what the power system is doing.	10	his or her position.
18	It's potential energy sitting in the operating pool.	18	First, and perhaps self-evidently, the correct
19	MR MINEAR: Okay, great.	10	interpretation for paragraph 8(c) must produce
20	DR MILES: Again, I speak under the control of my	20	a methodology for pondage calculation that produces
21	engineering colleagues.	21	a unique and fixed volume of maximum pondage, in
22	In the meantime, we are still left with a question.	22	cubic metres or millions of cubic metres, for each
23	We know what the critical inputs for the calculation of	23	Annexure D.3 HEP, and should be derived solely from the
24	maximum pondage are: that's paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i).	24	MMD that is to say, firm power at the site of the
25	And we know that the calculation is dependent on firm	25	HEP in question. Paragraph 8(c) itself, speaking as it
	Page 57		Page 59
10:49 1	power, which is a rate of production pegged to the MMD,	10:52 1	does of a criterion of design, plainly requires no less
10:49 1 2	power, which is a rate of production pegged to the MMD, and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's	10:52 1 2	does of a criterion of design, plainly requires no less and no more.
	and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity.		and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct
2 3 4	and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's	2	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation
2 3	and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective	2 3	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools
2 3 4 5 6	and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the	2 3 4 5 6	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's
2 3 4 5 6 7	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), 	2 3 4 5 6 7	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which firm power depends is a flow rate measured in 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator. And importantly, it's got to be capable of being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which firm power depends is a flow rate measured in cubic metres per second. Maximum pondage, however, is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator. And importantly, it's got to be capable of being done in a straightforward way. Because if it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which firm power depends is a flow rate measured in cubic metres per second. Maximum pondage, however, is an unchanging volume measured in cubic metres. So how 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator. And importantly, it's got to be capable of being done in a straightforward way. Because if it's straightforward, we're going to avoid disagreement
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which firm power depends is a flow rate measured in cubic metres. So how do we turn that second-by-second flow into a fixed 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator. And importantly, it's got to be capable of being done in a straightforward way. Because if it's straightforward, we're going to avoid disagreement between the parties as to what the outcome should be,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which firm power depends is a flow rate measured in cubic metres. So how do we turn that second-by-second flow into a fixed volume, is really the question that we're trying to 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator. And importantly, it's got to be capable of being done in a straightforward way. Because if it's straightforward, we're going to avoid disagreement between the parties as to what the outcome should be, what are the parameters of the calculation.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which firm power depends is a flow rate measured in cubic metres. So how do we turn that second-by-second flow into a fixed volume, is really the question that we're trying to determine here. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator. And importantly, it's got to be capable of being done in a straightforward way. Because if it's straightforward, we're going to avoid disagreement between the parties as to what the outcome should be, what are the parameters of the calculation.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which firm power depends is a flow rate measured in cubic metres per second. Maximum pondage, however, is an unchanging volume measured in cubic metres. So how do we turn that second-by-second flow into a fixed volume, is really the question that we're trying to determine here. Paragraph 8(c), however, doesn't give any overt 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator. And importantly, it's got to be capable of being done in a straightforward way. Because if it's straightforward, we're going to avoid disagreement between the parties as to what the outcome should be, what are the parameters of the calculation. A computationally dense methodology is not necessarily going to meet this criterion.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which firm power depends is a flow rate measured in cubic metres. So how do we turn that second-by-second flow into a fixed volume, is really the question that we're trying to determine here. Paragraph 8(c), however, doesn't give any overt indication as to how to make that work. And therefore, 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator. And importantly, it's got to be capable of being done in a straightforward way. Because if it's straightforward, we're going to avoid disagreement between the parties as to what the outcome should be, what are the parameters of the calculation. A computationally dense methodology is not necessarily going to meet this criterion. Now, third, the methodology produced by the correct
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 and potentially falling, therefore, well below the HEP's installed capacity. We also know that this is, at least on Pakistan's case, consistent with the Treaty's overarching objective of strictly limiting storage of the waters of the Western Rivers by India, consistent with Article III(4), and with the overall animus of the Treaty as identified by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award. (Slide 31) But what we don't know, to return to the question at hand, is how to define the pondage required for firm power. And you'll be happy to know that I turn to that now. The question posed is potentially a difficult one from a treaty interpretive standpoint. And the reason that it's difficult is that because the MMD on which firm power depends is a flow rate measured in cubic metres per second. Maximum pondage, however, is an unchanging volume measured in cubic metres. So how do we turn that second-by-second flow into a fixed volume, is really the question that we're trying to determine here. Paragraph 8(c), however, doesn't give any overt 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	and no more. Second, and perhaps less obviously, the correct interpretation must produce a pondage calculation methodology that can be reasonably executed using tools that were available at the time of the Treaty's drafting, so shortly before 1960. At that time, electronic computers, calculators and other advanced forms of computation would have been unknown to the Treaty's drafters, and so the correct interpretation of paragraph 8(c) cannot rely on calculations requiring or being rendered much more easy by their use. The correct calculation methodology must be capable of being performed using manual or graphical plotting, so with a pencil and paper, and possibly with a manually operated mechanical desktop calculator. And importantly, it's got to be capable of being done in a straightforward way. Because if it's straightforward, we're going to avoid disagreement between the parties as to what the outcome should be, what are the parameters of the calculation. A computationally dense methodology is not necessarily going to meet this criterion.

10:53 1	correction or be rendered unfit for purpose by future	1	period is, we must first look at the broader Treaty.
2	developments. Given that the volume of maximum pondage	2	As a general rule, the Treaty deals with two
3	is a design criterion that is fixed by river's hydrology	3	different kinds of period: it deals with daily
4	at the outset of the HEP's development, it is imperative	4	periods or, as sometimes described, 24-hour
5	that the result not need to be tweaked over time to meet	5	periods and weekly time periods. And this is
6	new or developing conditions.	6	apparent from, for example, paragraph 2(c) of
0 7	Fourth, the correct methodology should not be overly	0 7	Annexure D, which, as we have seen, refers to the "daily
	sensitive to outliers in the input data, but must be		and weekly loads of the plant".
8	-	8	• •
9	straightforward and robust, and not easily knocked	9	(Slide 33) There are other time periods mentioned in
10	off-course by spurious data errors or discrepancies.	10	
11	Were the situation otherwise, then the methodology used	11	speaks of periods of ten days. Now, Pakistan has
12	would merely propagate disagreements between the parties	12	2
13	on the volume of maximum pondage, which cannot have been	13	the reality of run-of-river HEP operations, which you
14	the drafters' intent.	14	can see on the slide. As we have seen, and as
15	Fifth, the methodology that the correct	15	paragraph 2(c) reminds us, such plants run in accordance
16	interpretation produces must rely solely on data	16	
17	expressly addressed in the Treaty. And in particular,	17	individual days before the cycle begins anew.
18	it should not rest on data which India is not required	18	So the two candidates for the applicable period are
19	to provide to Pakistan in the course of notifying	19	daily and weekly. And of the two of these, Pakistan
20	Pakistan of a new Annexure D.3 HEP under paragraph 9 of	20	considers that the daily cycle is plainly to be
21	Annexure D. Put another way, if the interpretation	21	preferred.
22	relies on information not mentioned in Appendix II to	22	Now, the reason why again starts with the practical
23	Annexure D, then it is ipso facto suspect.	23	reality of HEP operations. Run-of-river HEPs with
24	Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the correct	24	pondage run on 24-hour cycles, storing during the night
25	methodology should not be such that one party can	25	and then discharging during the day to meet the diurnal
	Page 61		Page 63
10.54 1		10.57 1	
10:54 1	manipulate the result to suit its own priorities, for	10:57 1	rhythms of consumers.
2	example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one	2	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is
2 3	example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct	2 3	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves
2 3 4	example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within	2 3 4	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator
2 3 4 5	example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum	2 3 4 5	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the
2 3 4 5 6	example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar	2 3 4 5 6	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the
2 3 4 5 6 7	example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its	2 3 4 5 6 7	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the
2 3 4 5 6	example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: Now, returning to the problem posed by 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage. DR MILES: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: Now, returning to the problem posed by paragraph 8(c), which is, as you'll recall, how to turn 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: It's not so clear to me how it would affect your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: Now, returning to the problem posed by paragraph 8(c), which is, as you'll recall, how to turn the second-by-second flow of the MMD into a fixed and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: It's not so clear to me how it would affect your calculation. So I think you can anticipate a question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: Now, returning to the problem posed by paragraph 8(c), which is, as you'll recall, how to turn the second-by-second flow of the MMD into a fixed and permanent volume of pondage. So the starting point of our answer is to establish, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: It's not so clear to me how it would affect your calculation. So I think you can anticipate a question from us of, if you applied your methodology to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: Now, returning to the problem posed by paragraph 8(c), which is, as you'll recall, how to turn the second-by-second flow of the MMD into a fixed and permanent volume of pondage. So the starting point of our answer is to establish, within the meaning of the provision, the time period 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: It's not so clear to me how it would affect your calculation. So I think you can anticipate a question from us of, if you applied your methodology to a seven-day period rather than a one-day period, how it would be different.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: Now, returning to the problem posed by paragraph 8(c), which is, as you'll recall, how to turn the second-by-second flow of the MMD into a fixed and permanent volume of pondage. So the starting point of our answer is to establish, within the meaning of the provision, the time period within which our analysis is going to take place. So 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: It's not so clear to me how it would affect your calculation. So I think you can anticipate a question from us of, if you applied your methodology to a seven-day period rather than a one-day period, how it would be different. DR MILES: I can take you to the answer now, or I can take
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: Now, returning to the problem posed by paragraph 8(c), which is, as you'll recall, how to turn the second-by-second flow of the MMD into a fixed and permanent volume of pondage. So the starting point of our answer is to establish, within the meaning of the provision, the time period within which our analysis is going to take place. So that's going to be derived from an interrogation of when 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: It's not so clear to me how it would affect your calculation. So I think you can anticipate a question from us of, if you applied your methodology to a seven-day period rather than a one-day period, how it would be different. DR MILES: I can take you to the answer now, or I can take you to the answer after I've told you what the full
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: Now, returning to the problem posed by paragraph 8(c), which is, as you'll recall, how to turn the second-by-second flow of the MMD into a fixed and permanent volume of pondage. So the starting point of our answer is to establish, within the meaning of the provision, the time period within which our analysis is going to take place. So that's going to be derived from an interrogation of when paragraph 8(c) anticipates that India will require 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: It's not so clear to me how it would affect your calculation. So I think you can anticipate a question from us of, if you applied your methodology to a seven-day period rather than a one-day period, how it would be different. DR MILES: I can take you to the answer now, or I can take you to the answer after I've told you what the full methodology is; I'm completely
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 example by making it dependent on mechanisms that one party can influence unilaterally. So the correct approach cannot enable India to rely on levers within its sole control to increase the amount of maximum pondage; and equally, Pakistan cannot rely on similar levers to reduce the size of the operating pool of its own motion. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, those criteria are all helpful. But I do want on focus on where the ambiguity is in the Treaty, or the point of disagreement between India and Pakistan. Am I right that really the critical phrase here is what we mean by "required for Firm Power"? DR MILES: That's correct, sir. MR MINEAR: Thank you. DR MILES: Now, returning to the problem posed by paragraph 8(c), which is, as you'll recall, how to turn the second-by-second flow of the MMD into a fixed and permanent volume of pondage. So the starting point of our answer is to establish, within the meaning of the provision, the time period within which our analysis is going to take place. So that's going to be derived from an interrogation of when 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And as the slide shows, our weekly load curve is composed of seven consecutive daily load curves reflecting roughly the same pattern. The HEP operator stores water at night for use during the day. If the load on the HEP for each of those days is met, then the weekly load is also met. And in this scenario, the power is firm power because it's available every day. This is why MR MINEAR: Excuse me again, Dr Miles. But this is all very important, and that's what is prompting my questions here. It seems to me clear in India's case that the distinction between a one-day cycle and a seven-day cycle is critical to the way they calculate pondage. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: It's not so clear to me how it would affect your calculation. So I think you can anticipate a question from us of, if you applied your methodology to a seven-day period rather than a one-day period, how it would be different. DR MILES: I can take you to the answer now, or I can take you to the answer after I've told you what the full

10:58 1	presentation and you can come to it in due course.	11:01 1	And it's worth noting this perhaps picks up on
2	DR MILES: Thank you very much.	2	Dr Blackmore's question in these provisions,
3	Now, as I've already shown you we've got the	3	a reference to "weekly" does not appear without
4	definition on the slide "pondage" is defined as	4	a reference to "daily", and at no point is priority to
5	referring to:	5	the weekly time period accorded.
6	" short-term storage of water, usually on a daily	6	At any rate, as I noted, from the perspective of
7	basis, to meet the diurnal variations in power demand."	7	pondage generally, meeting a weekly load merely requires
8	So that's our first reason: pondage is daily.	8	the meeting of seven daily loads.
9	(Slide 34) Now, beyond this, there are clues	9	Now, there are references also to weekly periods in
10	calculated within the Treaty itself. On the slide,	10	Annexures F and G on difference and dispute resolution
10	we've got a list of the provisions of the treaty which	10	modalities. They're purely procedural in character and
11	make reference to daily or 24-hourly time periods.	11	I think we can safely consider them irrelevant for
12	So we have Article I(15)(b), dealing with	12	present purposes.
13	"interference with the waters". That refers to any	13	Now, there is a further reason as to why a daily
14	"man-made obstruction" which causes "a change in the	15	time period is to be preferred over a weekly time
15	volume of the daily flow of the waters".	15	period, and that relates to one of the sufficiency
10	Article VI(1) requires the exchange of daily data by	10	criteria that I took you to earlier. If a weekly time
18	the parties.	18	period were to be applied, any calculation would
10	Within Annexure D, we have paragraph 2(c), which	10	necessarily entail consideration of the storage and
20	we've already looked at. We also have paragraph 2(h),	20	discharge schedules of paragraph 15.
20	concerning the need for regulating basins in certain	20	(Slide 35) As the Kishenganga Court held in its
21	HEPs, the purposes of such basins being:	22	partial award (PLA-3) in paragraph 506:
23	" to even out fluctuations in the discharge from	23	" in many instances the Treaty does not simply
23	the turbines arising from variations in the daily and	24	restrict the Parties from taking certain actions, but
25	weekly loads of the plant."	25	also constrains their entitlement to construct works
		_	
	Page 65		Page 67
11:00 1	We have paragraph 15 as well. And in Pakistan's	11:02 1	that would enable such actions to be taken "
11:00 1	We have paragraph 15 as well. And in Pakistan's submission, this is a provision of particular	11:02 1	that would enable such actions to be taken." (Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly
2	submission, this is a provision of particular	2	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly
2 3	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes,		(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to,
2 3 4	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and	2 3 4	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on
2 3 4 5	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining	2 3 4 5	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would
2 3 4	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that	2 3 4	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on
2 3 4 5 6	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining	2 3 4 5 6	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out.
2 3 4 5 6 7	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly	2 3 4 5 6 7	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers to the daily and, it must be said, weekly load	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed if you had to do it graphically.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers to the daily and, it must be said, weekly load fluctuations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed if you had to do it graphically. (Slide 37) Now, just to round off this point, I have
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers to the daily and, it must be said, weekly load fluctuations. On the slide, you will see that we also have a list	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	 (Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed if you had to do it graphically. (Slide 37) Now, just to round off this point, I have for you on the slide the various points in favour of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers to the daily and, it must be said, weekly load fluctuations. On the slide, you will see that we also have a list of the references to weekly periods in the Treaty.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 (Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed if you had to do it graphically. (Slide 37) Now, just to round off this point, I have for you on the slide the various points in favour of selecting a daily over a weekly period for the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers to the daily and, it must be said, weekly load fluctuations. On the slide, you will see that we also have a list of the references to weekly periods in the Treaty. They're far more sparse, and I think we've looked at	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 (Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed if you had to do it graphically. (Slide 37) Now, just to round off this point, I have for you on the slide the various points in favour of selecting a daily over a weekly period for the calculation of maximum pondage.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers to the daily and, it must be said, weekly load fluctuations. On the slide, you will see that we also have a list of the references to weekly periods in the Treaty. They're far more sparse, and I think we've looked at them already.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 (Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed if you had to do it graphically. (Slide 37) Now, just to round off this point, I have for you on the slide the various points in favour of selecting a daily over a weekly period for the calculation of maximum pondage.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers to the daily and, it must be said, weekly load fluctuations. On the slide, you will see that we also have a list of the references to weekly periods in the Treaty. They're far more sparse, and I think we've looked at them already. We have paragraphs 2(c) and 2(h) of Annexure D, and	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 (Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed if you had to do it graphically. (Slide 37) Now, just to round off this point, I have for you on the slide the various points in favour of selecting a daily over a weekly period for the calculation of maximum pondage. First, it is consistent with the ordinary operations of a run-of-river HEP with pondage, which will store and
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers to the daily and, it must be said, weekly load fluctuations. On the slide, you will see that we also have a list of the references to weekly periods in the Treaty. They're far more sparse, and I think we've looked at them already.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 (Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed if you had to do it graphically. (Slide 37) Now, just to round off this point, I have for you on the slide the various points in favour of selecting a daily over a weekly period for the calculation of maximum pondage.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	submission, this is a provision of particular importance, establishing, at least for these purposes, the operational parameters of an Annexure D.3 HEP, and therefore playing a contextual but not determining role in the interpretation of paragraph 8(c). And that provision, crucially, is not cast in terms of weekly cycle but in terms of "any period of seven consecutive days", again reflecting the reality of run-of-river HEP operations. Now, beyond this, and perhaps less significantly, we also have the provisions of paragraphs 2(b) and 4(h) of Appendix II to Annexure D. Paragraph 2(b) requires India to provide Pakistan with the daily discharge data on which its design is based, which data in due course will form the basis of the MMD calculation in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And paragraph 4(h) refers to the daily and, it must be said, weekly load fluctuations. On the slide, you will see that we also have a list of the references to weekly periods in the Treaty. They're far more sparse, and I think we've looked at them already. We have paragraphs 2(c) and 2(h) of Annexure D, and	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 (Slide 36) So paragraph 15, if we're doing a weekly time period, would probably need to be referred to, simply so that the operating pool wasn't calculated on the premise of a reservoir operation that India would never be able to carry out. The Court will recall that one of the sufficiency criteria that Pakistan has deployed for the correct methodology is that it must be capable of being implemented with calculation methods that were available in 1960 in a straightforward way. And this is sort of running ahead of myself a little when we talk about daily versus weekly calculations in Pakistan's methodology. Once paragraph 15 enters the lists, the complexity of the calculation increases considerably. And whilst it can be done with relative ease using a desktop computer, it would become quite dense indeed if you had to do it graphically. (Slide 37) Now, just to round off this point, I have for you on the slide the various points in favour of selecting a daily over a weekly period for the calculation of maximum pondage. First, it is consistent with the ordinary operations of a run-of-river HEP with pondage, which will store and

11:03 1	to meet the diurnal needs of consumers; and if it can do	11:06 1	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear.
2	that for seven days in a row, it's met the weekly	2	DR MILES: Subject to Mr Minear's question, of course.
3		3	MR MINEAR: If I could just ask: it would be instructive for
4		4	us to see the calculation that would be involved for
5		5	a seven-day determination. Is that something that
6		6	Pakistan is able to do in the course of the hearing?
7		7	DR MILES: I don't want to speak for Mr Rae, but I think
8		8	we are in a position and we should be able to provide
9		9	some form of that. Whether we can do it over the
1(10	weekend would be a separate question. But hopefully
11	• •	11	it could be done.
12		12	MR MINEAR: Thank you.
13		12	THE CHAIRMAN: Right. Why don't we proceed with your final
1.		13	bits before we take our break.
1:		14	DR MILES: Okay. Just to close off this point.
	-	15	Again, so far as the Western Rivers are concerned,
10			
17		17	the fact that you will have less pondage under a daily
18		18	calculation than a weekly calculation points towards
19		19	limiting India's use of the water of the Western Rivers,
20		20	and therefore should be preferred. And in Pakistan's
21	1 8	21	submission, that means that the answer to the question
22		22	of the applicable time period is clear: it assumes the
23		23	HEP is operating in accordance with the usual 24-hour
24		24	cycle.
25	interpreter must pick the option that best coheres with	25	That's my nine lines, Mr Chairman, if now is
	Page 69		Page 71
11:05 1	the object and purpose of the provision being	11:07 1	a convenient moment.
11:05 1 2	interpreted.	11:07 1 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you.
	interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at		THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break.
2	interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break,	2	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back
2 3	interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at	2 3	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break.
2 3 4	interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break,	2 3 4	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back
2 3 4 5	interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to	2 3 4 5	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it 	2 3 4 5 6	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you.I don't think we have any questions before we break.Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you.(11.08 am)
2 3 4 5 6 7	interpreted.THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so.Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due	2 3 4 5 6 7	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the approach to take. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free to refer to it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the approach to take. DR MILES: Let me put it this way: it can be done. It can 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free to refer to it. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the approach to take. DR MILES: Let me put it this way: it can be done. It can be done, but it increases the complexity of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free to refer to it. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the approach to take. DR MILES: Let me put it this way: it can be done. It can be done, but it increases the complexity of the calculation. And in Pakistan's submission, the more 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free to refer to it. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles. DR MILES: Thank you, Mr Chair. This was a propitious time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the approach to take. DR MILES: Let me put it this way: it can be done. It can be done, but it increases the complexity of the calculation. And in Pakistan's submission, the more straightforward the calculation, the less likely it is 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free to refer to it. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles. DR MILES: Thank you, Mr Chair. This was a propitious time for a coffee break because it now neatly leads me into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the approach to take. DR MILES: Let me put it this way: it can be done. It can be done, but it increases the complexity of the calculation. And in Pakistan's submission, the more straightforward the calculation, the less likely it is to propagate disagreement between the parties, and the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free to refer to it. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles. DR MILES: Thank you, Mr Chair. This was a propitious time for a coffee break because it now neatly leads me into the final part of the analysis, which is: what is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the approach to take. DR MILES: Let me put it this way: it can be done. It can be done, but it increases the complexity of the calculation. And in Pakistan's submission, the more straightforward the calculation, the less likely it is to propagate disagreement between the parties, and the more likely it is to be a sound, safe and enduring formula for the calculation of pondage moving forward. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free to refer to it. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles. DR MILES: Thank you, Mr Chair. This was a propitious time for a coffee break because it now neatly leads me into the final part of the analysis, which is: what is pondage required for firm power?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the approach to take. DR MILES: Let me put it this way: it can be done. It can be done, but it increases the complexity of the calculation. And in Pakistan's submission, the more straightforward the calculation, the less likely it is to propagate disagreement between the parties, and the more likely it is to be a sound, safe and enduring formula for the calculation of pondage moving forward. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free to refer to it. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles. DR MILES: Thank you, Mr Chair. This was a propitious time for a coffee break because it now neatly leads me into the final part of the analysis, which is: what is pondage required for firm power? Now, as I've already explained earlier in my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 interpreted. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, two points. One is that we are at the point where we might normally take a coffee break, so perhaps you could indicate when it is convenient to do so. Second, I'd be interested, either now or in due course, in hearing a bit more about how complex it really would be to develop that seven-day analysis. It seems to me, even in 1960, the building of a hydroelectric plant is a rather complex operation in and of itself, and a one-time effort to calculate a maximum pondage based on a seven-day cycle, it's not obvious to me that that is of such complexity that it's an important factor in deciding that that's not the approach to take. DR MILES: Let me put it this way: it can be done. It can be done, but it increases the complexity of the calculation. And in Pakistan's submission, the more straightforward the calculation, the less likely it is to propagate disagreement between the parties, and the more likely it is to be a sound, safe and enduring formula for the calculation of pondage moving forward. As to your other point about the coffee break, I am 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. I don't think we have any questions before we break. Let's go ahead and take our coffee break, and come back at 11.40. Thank you. (11.08 am) (A short break) (11.39 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Before we get started with Dr Miles, the Court has considered the application that Pakistan made for the admission of an additional document, which I believe is a letter between the two Commissioners perhaps dated 2010 or thereabouts, and the application is approved. So please do enter that into the record and you're free to refer to it. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles. DR MILES: Thank you, Mr Chair. This was a propitious time for a coffee break because it now neatly leads me into the final part of the analysis, which is: what is pondage required for firm power? Now, as I've already explained earlier in my remarks, although perhaps not precisely in these terms,

11:40 1	It enables the HEP operator to store potential energy	1	Paragraph 8(c) cannot be interpreted to mean that India
2	for part of a day, with the intention of supplementing	2	is entitled to whatever pondage may be necessary to
3	the natural river flow to deliver a particular discharge	3	enable it to generate firm power constantly throughout
4	rate, in metres per second, into the turbines for the	4	the dry season, irrespective of what the river happens
5	remainder of the day during times of peak demand.	5	to be doing on that particular day.
6	Thanks to paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i), we know what the	6	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.
7	flow rate is: it's the firm power rate, the MMD. Thanks	7	DR MILES: Yes, sir.
8	to the exercise in Treaty interpretation I carried out	8	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, thank you.
9	before the break, we now know the time period within	9	Let's perhaps go back to the previous slide (38), if
10	which we're undertaking this exercise: it's 24 hours.	10	you don't mind. (Pause)
10	Our only remaining question is the volume.	10	It is really this first sentence on "Pondage is
12	(Slide 39) This gives rise to four important	12	required". And I prompted you earlier on this word
12	realisations, which we will present on the slide. For	12	"instantaneous" that you used in your definition of
13	your note, they are drawn from paragraph 11.57 of	13	power.
15	Pakistan's Memorial.	15	I would reply, as an engineer, that it doesn't
16	First, when the river is running at or above the MMD	16	necessarily mean instantaneous power. You could even
10	at the HEP site, the HEP won't have any need for	10	argue that it never means instantaneous power, because
18	pondage: the natural flow is going to be sufficient for	18	we can't measure that. We measure at a certain
10	the HEP to generate firm power without any additional	10	frequency, and so there's inevitably a time period
20	releases from storage; pondage will not be required for	20	associated with it over which power is considered: it
21	firm power.	21	can be a minute, it can be a day, it can be a longer
22	Second, where the available flow of the river in	22	period. Obviously it's still a flux, but it just means
23	a given 24-hour period is less than the MMD, the HEP	23	that we talk about the average flux over that time
24	will not be able to generate firm power without	24	period.
25	supplemental flows at any point in time: pondage will be	25	So your assumption is that the power that is being
	Page 73		Page 75
11:41 1	required for firm power, supplementing the flow to the	11:44 1	generated is instantaneous. But if you would look at
11:41 1 2	required for firm power, supplementing the flow to the MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate.	11:44 1 2	generated is instantaneous. But if you would look at the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes
	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation,		the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period,
2	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be	2	the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that
2 3	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the	2 3	the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation,
2 3 4 5 6	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD.	2 3 4 5 6	the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of	2 3 4 5 6 7	the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in	2 3 4 5 6	the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may be meandering around the MMD level, sometimes being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous. As I was saying, paragraph 8(c) cannot be
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may be meandering around the MMD level, sometimes being above, sometimes below; on other days, the river may 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous. As I was saying, paragraph 8(c) cannot be interpreted to mean that India is entitled to whatever
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may be meandering around the MMD level, sometimes being above, sometimes below; on other days, the river may spend the whole day running below the MMD level. And	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous. As I was saying, paragraph 8(c) cannot be interpreted to mean that India is entitled to whatever pondage may be necessary to enable it to generate firm
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may be meandering around the MMD level, sometimes being above, sometimes below; on other days, the river may spend the whole day running below the MMD level. And self-evidently, the amount of pondage required for firm	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous. As I was saying, paragraph 8(c) cannot be interpreted to mean that India is entitled to whatever pondage may be necessary to enable it to generate firm power constantly throughout the dry season, irrespective
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may be meandering around the MMD level, sometimes being above, sometimes below; on other days, the river may spend the whole day running below the MMD level. And self-evidently, the amount of pondage required for firm power in the former case will be less than the amount of 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous. As I was saying, paragraph 8(c) cannot be interpreted to mean that India is entitled to whatever pondage may be necessary to enable it to generate firm power constantly throughout the dry season, irrespective of what the river happens to be doing on that particular
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may be meandering around the MMD level, sometimes being above, sometimes below; on other days, the river may spend the whole day running below the MMD level. And self-evidently, the amount of pondage required for firm power in the former case will be less than the amount of pondage required in the latter case: the river will	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous. As I was saying, paragraph 8(c) cannot be interpreted to mean that India is entitled to whatever pondage may be necessary to enable it to generate firm power constantly throughout the dry season, irrespective of what the river happens to be doing on that particular day. And that's because the precise flow of the river
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may be meandering around the MMD level, sometimes being above, sometimes below; on other days, the river may spend the whole day running below the MMD level. And self-evidently, the amount of pondage required for firm power in the former case will be less than the amount of pondage required in the latter case: the river will requires less assistance to reach the MMD level.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous. As I was saying, paragraph 8(c) cannot be interpreted to mean that India is entitled to whatever pondage may be necessary to enable it to generate firm power constantly throughout the dry season, irrespective of what the river happens to be doing on that particular day. And that's because the precise flow of the river cannot be predicted with any certainty on a daily,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may be meandering around the MMD level, sometimes being above, sometimes below; on other days, the river may spend the whole day running below the MMD level. And self-evidently, the amount of pondage required for firm power in the former case will be less than the amount of pondage required in the latter case: the river will	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous. As I was saying, paragraph 8(c) cannot be interpreted to mean that India is entitled to whatever pondage may be necessary to enable it to generate firm power constantly throughout the dry season, irrespective of what the river happens to be doing on that particular day. And that's because the precise flow of the river
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	MMD by releasing water from storage at a given rate. Third, for the purposes of the pondage calculation, therefore, paragraph 8(c) assumes that pondage will be required for firm power where the daily flow of the water from the river is less than the MMD. As we know from the formula for the calculation of the MMD, this, in all probability, will occur only in the dry season and with relative lack of frequency. At all other times during the year, the flow of the water will be above the MMD flow rate, and thus sufficient to generate firm power, plus additional secondary power, without the need for releases from storage. Fourth, the volume of pondage required for firm power will therefore depend on the difference between the natural flow of the river and the MMD over a 24-hour period. And this may vary: on some days, the river may be meandering around the MMD level, sometimes being above, sometimes below; on other days, the river may spend the whole day running below the MMD level. And self-evidently, the amount of pondage required for firm power in the former case will be less than the amount of pondage required in the latter case: the river will requires less assistance to reach the MMD level.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 the literature, you see that firm power is sometimes defined as the average power over a critical period, including the period over a day. And I believe that that might lead to quite a different interpretation, perhaps an interpretation that India might put forward. Can you comment on why, specifically, you believe that it's the instantaneous power, and not power averaged over a longer period, including, for example, a day? DR MILES: With your permission, I think I'll bank that question and maybe think about it a little bit more in slower time, and perhaps address it in the second round, once I've had a chance to speak to colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. DR MILES: But we'll proceed on the basis for now that it's instantaneous. As I was saying, paragraph 8(c) cannot be interpreted to mean that India is entitled to whatever pondage may be necessary to enable it to generate firm power constantly throughout the dry season, irrespective of what the river happens to be doing on that particular day. And that's because the precise flow of the river cannot be predicted with any certainty on a daily,

11:46 1	how much pondage will be required for firm power.	11:49 1	operator is producing firm power. And at the end of it,
2	Pondage is not permitted simply because there is	2	they will have discharged all the water that entered the
3	a drop in flow in the river; only when and for so	3	reservoir in the course of the applicable 24-hour period
4	long as the drop falls below the MMD.	4	through the turbines at the MMD rate within that same
5	(Slide 40) So we're now closing in on what, in	5	24-hour period.
6	Pakistan's submission, the phrase "Pondage required for	6	Put another way, they will have produced firm power
7	Firm Power" means.	7	for the greatest duration possible within 24 hours,
8	Bearing in mind the function of pondage as	8	using all the flow available in that 24 hours. The
9	a battery, its role is to ensure that where sub-MMD flow	9	storage available has provided the HEP with the pondage
10	is provided by the river over a 24-hour period, that	10	required for firm power.
10	flow can be effectively utilised to allow the HEP to	11	Now, this prompts two further corollaries which are
12	produce firm power for part of that time period.	12	important.
13	Put another way, the storage afforded by pondage	13	If the HEP had less storage than that amount
14	must be sufficient to allow the HEP operator to	14	available, then the storage would be insufficient for
15	discharge all the water that enters the reservoir in the	15	firm power. The storage would be filled, it would be
16	course of 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate	16	discharged at the MMD rate, and then it would run out
17	within that same 24-hour period, because we're	17	before the end of the 24 hours. So there would still be
18	calculating over a period of 24 hours. And they're	18	a portion of the period in which firm power could not be
19	going to store for that part of the period and they're	19	produced. For that period, the HEP operator would need
20	going to discharge for that part of the period.	20	to be satisfied by whatever could be produced using the
21	But put another way, the pondage required for firm	21	natural flow.
22	power is the storage capacity sufficient to pass the	22	If the HEP had more storage available, then that
23	entire daily inflow volume through the HEP turbines at	23	additional storage would not be required for firm power.
24	the MMD rate. And exactly how much this capacity will	24	The storage would exceed the specified need. Indeed, if
25	be will be determined by the flow rate on a particular	25	used, any additional storage would be counterproductive
	D 77		D 70
	Page 77		Page 79
11:47 1	day.	11:50 1	to the mission of providing firm power, because while it
11:47 1	day. (Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to	11:50 1 2	to the mission of providing firm power, because while it was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the
	-		was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be
2	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres	2	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not
2 3	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic]	2 3	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional
2 3 4	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if	2 3 4	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be
2 3 4 5 6 7	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's	2 3 4 5 6 7	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 (Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the operating pool. And when he or she has stored enough	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that pondage will only be required if the river in question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 (Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the operating pool. And when he or she has stored enough water, it can be released through the turbine for the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that pondage will only be required if the river in question is flowing below the MMD.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 (Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the operating pool. And when he or she has stored enough water, it can be released through the turbine for the remaining part of the 24 hours at 25 [cubic] metres 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that pondage will only be required if the river in question is flowing below the MMD. But from an engineering perspective, that
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the operating pool. And when he or she has stored enough water, it can be released through the turbine for the remaining part of the 24 hours at 25 [cubic] metres a second. When added to the 75 [cubic] metres a second	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	 was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that pondage will only be required if the river in question is flowing below the MMD. But from an engineering perspective, that information is sufficient. Knowing the MMD, and knowing
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the operating pool. And when he or she has stored enough water, it can be released through the turbine for the remaining part of the 24 hours at 25 [cubic] metres a second. When added to the 75 [cubic] metres a second of natural flow in the river, the result is 100 [cubic]	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that pondage will only be required if the river in question is flowing below the MMD. But from an engineering perspective, that information is sufficient. Knowing the MMD, and knowing that pondage will only be required in sub-MMD
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the operating pool. And when he or she has stored enough water, it can be released through the turbine for the remaining part of the 24 hours at 25 [cubic] metres a second. When added to the 75 [cubic] metres a second of natural flow in the river, the result is 100 [cubic] metres a second, the MMD rate.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that pondage will only be required if the river in question is flowing below the MMD. But from an engineering perspective, that information is sufficient. Knowing the MMD, and knowing that pondage will only be required in sub-MMD conditions, it is possible to determine the storage
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the operating pool. And when he or she has stored enough water, it can be released through the turbine for the remaining part of the 24 hours at 25 [cubic] metres a second. When added to the 75 [cubic] metres a second of natural flow in the river, the result is 100 [cubic] metres a second, the MMD rate. So the result of that is going to be that for the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that pondage will only be required if the river in question is flowing below the MMD. But from an engineering perspective, that information is sufficient. Knowing the MMD, and knowing that pondage will only be required in sub-MMD conditions, it is possible to determine the storage volume that will be required to ensure that a HEP will
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the operating pool. And when he or she has stored enough water, it can be released through the turbine for the remaining part of the 24 hours at 25 [cubic] metres a second. When added to the 75 [cubic] metres a second of natural flow in the river, the result is 100 [cubic] metres a second, the MMD rate.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that pondage will only be required if the river in question is flowing below the MMD. But from an engineering perspective, that information is sufficient. Knowing the MMD, and knowing that pondage will only be required in sub-MMD conditions, it is possible to determine the storage
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	(Slide 41) That's a little bit complicated to visualise, so we've got an example for you on the slide. So let's assume that our MMD is 100 [cubic] metres a second, but that the river flow is at 75 [cubic] metres a second for the 24 hours in question. So if there's no operating pool, no pondage in the HEP's reservoir, what's going to happen? Well, you get no firm power. The 75-[cubic]-metres-per-second flow passes through the turbines continually for 24 hours, but because there's no storage, the HEP can't get the extra 25 [cubic] metres a second of flow it needs to get to the MMD level, and therefore you don't have the firm power. But what happens if you've got storage? Well, the HEP operator can take that 75 [cubic] metres a second of flow and store it for part of the 24 hours in the operating pool. And when he or she has stored enough water, it can be released through the turbine for the remaining part of the 24 hours at 25 [cubic] metres a second. When added to the 75 [cubic] metres a second of natural flow in the river, the result is 100 [cubic] metres a second, the MMD rate. So the result of that is going to be that for the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 was in the process of being filled, it would reduce the amount of time during the 24 hours that the HEP could be producing power. While you're storing, you're not producing. So if you're filling that additional storage, you're giving up on valuable time that could be used producing firm power. So if we pull all of this together, we see that the question of pondage required for firm power is really the search for an equilibrium point, being the point at which the storage is sufficient such that, when filled for part of the applicable 24 hours, it will allow firm power to be produced constantly for the rest of that time period; no more, no less. The only question remaining is the question of river flow rate, which, as I have noted, is not going to be known in advance. The only factor that is known is that pondage will only be required if the river in question is flowing below the MMD. But from an engineering perspective, that information is sufficient. Knowing the MMD, and knowing that pondage will only be required in sub-MMD conditions, it is possible to determine the storage volume that will be required to ensure that a HEP will

11:51 1	possible in any given 24-hour period from any sub-MMD	11:54 1	100% of the MMD or higher, the amount of pondage
2	flow.	2	required for firm power is going to be zero, as the
3	That exercise involves balancing the flow volume	3	natural flow of the river is sufficient for constant
4	entering the operating pool over any given 24-hour	4	firm power.
5	period against the passage of this volume through the	5	Where the river is flowing only a small amount below
6	HEP turbines at the MMD rate. And the amount of pondage	6	the MMD, so say 90% of the MMD, then relatively little
7	required for any given inflow rate will be that which	7	pondage will be required, as the natural flow of the
8	maximises the number of hours that the HEP can be	8	river requires only minor additional flow to reach the
9	operated at firm power.	9	MMD level, and it will take very little time to store
10	(Slide 42) Now, the mathematics of this forgive	10	this, given how plentiful the flow already is. So the
11	the somewhat dense slide the mathematics required to	11	result is a relatively lengthy period of time producing
12	do this are reflected in a simple water bank balance	12	· ·
13	exercise that would have been well understood by the	13	
14	Treaty's drafters. The calculations necessary to do	14	
15	that are set out in Appendix E of the Memorial. But it	15	
16	may be helpful for me to explain how this calculation	16	
17	works for a particular flow rate.	17	
18	So on any day, the inflow rate is given. So let's	18	6
19	go back to our inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres	19	
20	a second, and that's the equivalent of 6.48 million	20	
21	cubic metres a day.	21	And finally, when the river is flowing well below
22	Now, the MMD discharge is known, and for this	22	
23	example we'll assume once again it's 100 [cubic] metres	23	
24	a second. So our inflow rate over the day is going to	24	
25	be 75% of our MMD.	25	even lower flow of water into the reservoir, even more
	Page 81		Page 83
11.52 1		11.55 1	
11:52 1	Now, based on the daily inflow together with the MMD	11:55 1	time for storage is required. The result is a shorter
2	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant	2	period for the production of firm power over the
2 3	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance,	2 3	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period.
2 3 4	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power	2 3 4	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of
2 3 4 5	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is	2 3 4 5	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point
2 3 4 5 6	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours	2 3 4 5 6	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need
2 3 4 5 6 7	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production.	2 3 4 5 6 7	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage volumes required to maximise firm power for every value	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount of firm power the HEP could produce within that period.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage volumes required to maximise firm power for every value of inflow less than the MMD.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount of firm power the HEP could produce within that period. And this, therefore, that maximum value, is the pondage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage volumes required to maximise firm power for every value of inflow less than the MMD. (Slide 43) And that's going to result in the pattern	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount of firm power the HEP could produce within that period. And this, therefore, that maximum value, is the pondage required for firm power.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage volumes required to maximise firm power for every value of inflow less than the MMD. (Slide 43) And that's going to result in the pattern that we see plotted on the slide. So just to describe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount of firm power the HEP could produce within that period. And this, therefore, that maximum value, is the pondage required for firm power. Now, it may sorry, Mr Minear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage volumes required to maximise firm power for every value of inflow less than the MMD. (Slide 43) And that's going to result in the pattern that we see plotted on the slide. So just to describe what you're seeing.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount of firm power. Now, it may sorry, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, actually I found the Memorial clearer
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage volumes required to maximise firm power for every value of inflow less than the MMD. (Slide 43) And that's going to result in the pattern that we see plotted on the slide. So just to describe what you're seeing. Pondage will only be required if the river is	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount of firm power. Now, it may sorry, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, actually I found the Memorial clearer on this matter than this exposition. That just might be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage volumes required to maximise firm power for every value of inflow less than the MMD. (Slide 43) And that's going to result in the pattern that we see plotted on the slide. So just to describe what you're seeing.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount of firm power. Now, it may sorry, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, actually I found the Memorial clearer
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage volumes required to maximise firm power for every value of inflow less than the MMD. (Slide 43) And that's going to result in the pattern that we see plotted on the slide. So just to describe what you're seeing. Pondage will only be required if the river is flowing below the MMD. So when the river is flowing at	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount of firm power. Now, it may sorry, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, actually I found the Memorial clearer on this matter than this exposition. That just might be a matter of my personal taste here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	flow rate, we can compute the number of hours the plant can operate at firm power. So in this circumstance, we've got our daily inflow, divided by the firm power rate, which results in 64,000 seconds, which is 18 hours. So the daily inflow rate arriving in 24 hours is enough to give us 18 hours of firm power production. Now, what that means is: if the plant is going to be operating for 18 hours, it needs to be collecting water for the first 6 hours in the operating pool, prior to releasing stored water by turning on the turbines. So for an inflow rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, we need a pondage volume that's equivalent to 6 hours of inflow; and at the rate of 75 [cubic] metres a second, that becomes 1.62 million cubic metres of pondage. And because the MMD is fixed, we only need to repeat these calculations for a variety of inflows from 0 to 100% of the MMD, and that will produce different pondage volumes required to maximise firm power for every value of inflow less than the MMD. (Slide 43) And that's going to result in the pattern that we see plotted on the slide. So just to describe what you're seeing. Pondage will only be required if the river is	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 period for the production of firm power over the applicable 24-hour period. Now, somewhere along this continuum of 0 to 100% of the MMD, we are going to reach a point, and that point will be where, given the available inflow and the need to balance time for storage with time for the production of firm power, the greatest amount of pondage required for firm power will be reached. And that's the largest volume of storage that could conceivably be used for the production of firm power in a given 24-hour period in any sub-MMD hydrological condition. Put another way, it's the largest volume of storage that will be required if 24 hours of sub-MMD flow is to be: (a) passed through the HEP's turbines (b) at the MMD rate, within (c) the same 24-hour period. It follows that any storage beyond this amount would be redundant, as it would not contribute to the amount of firm power. Now, it may sorry, Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, actually I found the Memorial clearer on this matter than this exposition. That just might be

11:57 1	Can I note one small thing, because I know you pay	11:59 1	operating pool. And that means that 1.25 million
2	close attention to details. In Appendix E in	2	cubic metres in stored volume is going to be required
3	paragraph 21, you state I think you'll be able to	3	for firm power. That's how much we are going to be
4	pick up on this:	4	needing in order to get the additional 8 hours to put
5	"The Pondage required for Firm Power happens to be	5	through the turbines.
6	when the flow rate is equal to 50% of the MMD."	6	Now, moving down to 50% of the MMD. The flow is
7	That's the point you're just going to get to right	7	less, and so the necessary storage time is going to be
8	now.	8	greater; and equally, a greater volume of pondage will
	DR MILES: That's what I'm building up to, yes, sir.	8	be required for firm power.
9 10	MR MINEAR: I think you meant don't you mean the maximum	9 10	
10	pondage required?		So we've got 12 hours here of firm power production,
11	DR MILES: Yes, I do mean the maximum.	11 12	meaning that half of our 24-hour period is used for storing water and half the 24-hour period is being used
12	MR MINEAR: Yes, maximum	12	for releasing it. And this results, in turn, in 6 hours
13	DR MILES: No, no, no, I mean that's the pondage required	13	of MMD inflow being stored in the operating pool.
15	for firm power. The maximum pondage required is that	14	12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD necessarily
15	figure times 2, because the maximum pondage in the	15	results in 6 hours of MMD inflow being stored, because
10	operating pool shall be double the pondage required for	10	it's 50% of the MMD times 2: 6 times 2 is 12. And this
17	firm power. So I'll have to check the paragraph.	17	leads to 1.41 million cubic metres in stored volume,
10	MR MINEAR: Yes, take a look at	13	being again the volume required for firm power in these
20	DR MILES: I'll take a look at that and I'll get back to	20	conditions.
20	you. Thank you.	20	But let's now move down to the bottom entry of the
21	MR MINEAR: Paragraph 21 of that, yes.	21	table, which we will see is quite revealing, in my
22	DR MILES: (Slide 44) Now, you found it clearer: in that	22	submission. 33.3% of the MMD: it's really a trickle.
23 24	case, let me take you back to the Memorial, Mr Minear.	23	At that flow rate, we have 8 hours of firm power
25	You may recognise on the slide, this is in fact from the	24	production. Therefore, we've got 16 hours of storage
-		25	
	Page 85		Page 87
11:58 1	Memorial, figure 11.3. And what I've done there is	12:01 1	time: 24 minus 8 is 16. But because of the reduced flow
11:58 1 2	Memorial, figure 11.3. And what I've done there is I've applied the process I've just described to India's	12:01 1 2	time: 24 minus 8 is 16. But because of the reduced flow of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow
2	I've applied the process I've just described to India's	2	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow
2 3	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres	2 3	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And
2 3 4	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various	2 3 4	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable
2 3 4 5	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment	2 3 4 5	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%.
2 3 4 5 6	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier.	2 3 4 5 6	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the
2 3 4 5 6 7	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens	2 3 4 5 6 7	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy. So let's skip down to 66.7% of the MMD. We're below	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period means that eventually the HEP operator is going to need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy. So let's skip down to 66.7% of the MMD. We're below the MMD, so we're going to be requiring pondage for firm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period means that eventually the HEP operator is going to need to stop storing and start discharging. And that means
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy. So let's skip down to 66.7% of the MMD. We're below the MMD, so we're going to be requiring pondage for firm power.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period means that eventually the HEP operator is going to need to stop storing and start discharging. And that means that, at that equilibrium point, a decrease in flow will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy. So let's skip down to 66.7% of the MMD. We're below the MMD, so we're going to be requiring pondage for firm power.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period means that eventually the HEP operator is going to need to stop storing and start discharging. And that means that, at that equilibrium point, a decrease in flow will mean a decrease in the amount of pondage required for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy. So let's skip down to 66.7% of the MMD. We're below the MMD, so we're going to be requiring pondage for firm power. So we're going to get 16 hours of firm power production; pretty respectable. We have 8 hours of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period means that eventually the HEP operator is going to need to stop storing and start discharging. And that means that, at that equilibrium point, a decrease in flow will mean a decrease in the amount of pondage required for firm power, notwithstanding an increase in storage time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy. So let's skip down to 66.7% of the MMD. We're below the MMD, so we're going to be requiring pondage for firm power. So we're going to get 16 hours of firm power production; pretty respectable. We have 8 hours of filling time, being the balance of the 24 hours. That	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period means that eventually the HEP operator is going to need to stop storing and start discharging. And that means that, at that equilibrium point, a decrease in flow will mean a decrease in the amount of pondage required for firm power, notwithstanding an increase in storage time. (Slide 45) And that's what produces this. Again,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy. So let's skip down to 66.7% of the MMD. We're below the MMD, so we're going to be requiring pondage for firm power.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period means that eventually the HEP operator is going to need to stop storing and start discharging. And that means that, at that equilibrium point, a decrease in flow will mean a decrease in the amount of pondage required for firm power, notwithstanding an increase in storage time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy. So let's skip down to 66.7% of the MMD. We're below the MMD, so we're going to be requiring pondage for firm power. So we're going to get 16 hours of firm power production; pretty respectable. We have 8 hours of filling time, being the balance of the 24 hours. That results in 5.33 hours of MMD inflow being stored in the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period means that eventually the HEP operator is going to need to stop storing and start discharging. And that means that, at that equilibrium point, a decrease in flow will mean a decrease in the amount of pondage required for firm power, notwithstanding an increase in storage time. (Slide 45) And that's what produces this. Again, Mr Minear, you'll recognise this from the Memorial.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I've applied the process I've just described to India's Kiru HEP, with its MMD of 65.3 [cubic] metres per second. And we've got a table plotting the various storage and discharge values in particular sub-MMD conditions. And if you look at the table for a moment you'll see what I described earlier. In the first entry at the top, we see what happens when the Chenab is flowing throughout the day at 100% of the MMD. So that's when pondage is not required for firm power. So in column B we have 24 hours of firm power production, which is unsurprising, given the flow rate. In column C, the flow rate being what it is, we equally have 0 hours of storage. So we don't need to store it all. In column D, we have 0 hours of MMD inflow stored in the operating pool. And then of course in column E, we have 0 cubic metres in stored volume. That's all very easy. So let's skip down to 66.7% of the MMD. We're below the MMD, so we're going to be requiring pondage for firm power. So we're going to get 16 hours of firm power production; pretty respectable. We have 8 hours of filling time, being the balance of the 24 hours. That	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	of the water, even 16 hours of storage time at that flow rate produces only 5.33 hours of MMD storage. And that's comparable to 6 hours of MMD flow being capable of being stored in 12 hours if the flow is at 50%. Therefore, despite the greater storage time, the volume of pondage required to maximise firm power in these hydrological conditions is actually only 1.25 million cubic metres. And that's the same volume that we require when the river flows at 66.7% of the MMD; and that results in 16 hours of firm power production, as the flow rate is higher even when the storage time is less. So what this table shows, and why I've put it on the slide, is that the relationship between pondage and flow rate is not a linear relationship. It's not simply a case of: less flow means more pondage. The need to maximise firm power production in a given 24-hour period means that eventually the HEP operator is going to need to stop storing and start discharging. And that means that, at that equilibrium point, a decrease in flow will mean a decrease in the amount of pondage required for firm power, notwithstanding an increase in storage time. (Slide 45) And that's what produces this. Again,

12:03 1	This parabolic curve, considering the Kiru HEP, plots	12:06 1	what you are looking at so that we can call it up?
2	out the values that we saw on the previous table while	2	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, let me Appendix E2 of
3	_	3	Pakistan's Memorial. So volume 2, Appendix E2,
2	Looking at this from right to left, we can see that	4	figure 1.
5	as the flow rate drops below the MMD of	5	MR MINEAR: It's at page 4 of Appendix E2.
e	65.3 cubic metres a second, the storage required is	6	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes.
7		7	DR MILES: Yes, very good. I thought it might be
8	as the inflection point is approached, before reversing	8	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: It accompanies the calculations which
ç	and decreasing, falling away entirely as the flow rate	9	also have the figure which you've got on your slide.
10) reaches zero.	10	DR MILES: Yes.
1	This reflects the fact that, as I just mentioned,	11	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I understand that Pakistan's
12	2 beyond a particular flow rate, the HEP is not going to	12	calculations aim to remove the need for a load curve.
13	get any additional benefit at least from a firm power	13	But from an engineering perspective, the curve that you
14	production perspective from additional pondage. The	14	come up with, with 12 hours of power production and then
1.	flow rate is going to be insufficient to fill it in the	15	12 hours switched off, seems to essentially perform the
10	5 time available if firm power production is to be	16	same function of a load curve. You could even consider
17	7 maximised.	17	it potentially a synthetic load curve that is used to
18	Now, critically, and as a matter of simple	18	perform the calculations.
19	mathematics, as Appendix E shows, the inflection point	19	Would you agree with that conceptualisation of your
20) is going to be the same for every HEP applying this	20	calculations?
2	formula. In other words, it is a unique and fixed value	21	DR MILES: I'm not sure I would, because a load curve is
22	2 for every HEP which can be calculated knowing only the	22	going to be something that is linked to power demand.
23	value of the MMD. And it reflects the pondage volume	23	This isn't linked to power demand; this is linked to
24	required to store 12 hours of inflow at 50% of the MMD,	24	hydrology, and it's about the ability to store water in
25	and that's going to result in the maximum usable pondage	25	a given amount of time. It's not directed in terms of
			D 01
	Page 89		Page 91
1	volume on a 24-hour operating schedule. It's the apex		
	volume on a 24-nour operating schedule. It's the apex	12:07 1	load on the plant or anything of the sort. It's merely,
2	of the curve.	12:07 1 2	load on the plant or anything of the sort. It's merely, if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably
2	of the curve.	2	if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably
2 3	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.	2 3	if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely
2 3 4	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this	2 3 4	if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load.
2 3 4 5	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective.	2 3 4 5	if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same:
2 3 4 5 6	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find	2 3 4 5 6	if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain
2 3 4 5 6 7	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more	2 3 4 5 6 7	if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure. SIR DANIEL: I don't know whether it's possible to have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate. Now, I suppose you could say that this sort of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure. SIR DANIEL: I don't know whether it's possible to have the Registry in control of the screens while Dr Miles's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate. Now, I suppose you could say that this sort of reflects some species of storage and discharge schedule.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure. SIR DANIEL: I don't know whether it's possible to have the Registry in control of the screens while Dr Miles's slides are already on the screens. He is the one who is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate. Now, I suppose you could say that this sort of reflects some species of storage and discharge schedule. But again, it's based on hydrology, not demand. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure. SIR DANIEL: I don't know whether it's possible to have the Registry in control of the screens while Dr Miles's slides are already on the screens. He is the one who is in control of the screens at the moment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate. Now, I suppose you could say that this sort of reflects some species of storage and discharge schedule. But again, it's based on hydrology, not demand. And indeed, it's not placing any operational parameters on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure. SIR DANIEL: I don't know whether it's possible to have the Registry in control of the screens while Dr Miles's slides are already on the screens. He is the one who is in control of the screens at the moment. THE CHAIRMAN: One possibility is that we all just get that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate. Now, I suppose you could say that this sort of reflects some species of storage and discharge schedule. But again, it's based on hydrology, not demand. And indeed, it's not placing any operational parameters on what could be done at any particular point in time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure. SIR DANIEL: I don't know whether it's possible to have the Registry in control of the screens. He is the one who is in control of the screens at the moment. THE CHAIRMAN: One possibility is that we all just get that in front of us in hard copy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate. Now, I suppose you could say that this sort of reflects some species of storage and discharge schedule. But again, it's based on hydrology, not demand. And indeed, it's not placing any operational parameters on what could be done at any particular point in time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No. But presumably the operator would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure. SIR DANIEL: I don't know whether it's possible to have the Registry in control of the screens while Dr Miles's slides are already on the screens. He is the one who is in control of the screens at the moment. THE CHAIRMAN: One possibility is that we all just get that in front of us in hard copy. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Or if it's possible to bring it up 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate. Now, I suppose you could say that this sort of reflects some species of storage and discharge schedule. But again, it's based on hydrology, not demand. And indeed, it's not placing any operational parameters on what could be done at any particular point in time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No. But presumably the operator would only operate a plant in this way if it would match
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure. SIR DANIEL: I don't know whether it's possible to have the Registry in control of the screens while Dr Miles's slides are already on the screens. He is the one who is in control of the screens at the moment. THE CHAIRMAN: One possibility is that we all just get that in front of us in hard copy. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Or if it's possible to bring it up later, I'm happy to wait; whatever way is most 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate. Now, I suppose you could say that this sort of reflects some species of storage and discharge schedule. But again, it's based on hydrology, not demand. And indeed, it's not placing any operational parameters on what could be done at any particular point in time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No. But presumably the operator would only operate a plant in this way if it would match better on to his load, compared to just running it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 of the curve. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, I would like to unpack this a bit further from an engineering perspective. I find this figure very informative, but I find figure 1 in Appendix E2 of your Memorial even more informative. But I quickly went through your slides, and I'm afraid I can't find it. I guess you won't bring it up? DR MILES: Do we have the capability to do that? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: If it is possible to bring it up. It directly relates, obviously, to these calculations. But I find it easier to hang my questions on that figure. SIR DANIEL: I don't know whether it's possible to have the Registry in control of the screens. He is the one who is in control of the screens at the moment. THE CHAIRMAN: One possibility is that we all just get that in front of us in hard copy. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Or if it's possible to bring it up later, I'm happy to wait; whatever way is most convenient. (Pause) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 if you want, a sort of "storage schedule", is probably the highest that I would put it. It's driven entirely by hydrology, not load. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But the purpose is the same: concentrating the power production during a certain period of the day, and reducing it, so inducing variability in the power production. From an engineering perspective, the only reason to do that would be to be able to supply the power at the moment of high demand. DR MILES: Well, except, again, for the point that we're not actually meeting demand here in any way, shape or form. I mean, the intention here is to produce power at a particular rate. Now, I suppose you could say that this sort of reflects some species of storage and discharge schedule. But again, it's based on hydrology, not demand. And indeed, it's not placing any operational parameters on what could be done at any particular point in time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No. But presumably the operator would only operate a plant in this way if it would match better on to his load, compared to just running it without any variation; would you think?

r			
12:09 1	particular species of load. This is a situation in	12:11 1	that, from a certain point of view, indicates the
12.09 1	which we are trying to figure out: given all the	2	generosity of Pakistan's calculation. Because we
3	possible permutations of the ways in which firm power	3	obviously don't know what the rate below MMD is going to
4	might be produced, what is the greatest amount of firm	4	be. So the system that we've set up here, or the way in
5	power that somebody is going to be able to produce? And	5	which we believe the Treaty is to be interpreted, means
6	that's sort of what drives this particular curve that	6	that no matter what happens, India is going to be
7			getting a meaningful amount of firm power production
	you see in front of you.	7	
8	Irrespective of what the inflow rate on a particular	8	every day.
9	day is going to be, this is the greatest amount that is	9	Now, if we'd optimised it for a higher value,
10	ever possibly going to be required. Now, it can be	10	a higher MMD, looking against the background of the
11	dispatched in any way that they require, but the storage	11	hydrological record, that would result in a situation in
12	is going to be there so it can be filled and discharged:	12	which we were actually providing for less pondage,
13	they can fill a little bit, they can drop a little bit,	13	because obviously you've got a situation in which the
14	they can do whatever they want within these operational	14	higher river inflow means that you'll have greater time
15	parameters.	15	at firm power.
16	But I am quite resistant to the idea of calling it	16	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But it also means that you run your
17	some species of load curve.	17	system at less than optimal conditions.
18	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, that's what I'm trying to probe you	18	DR MILES: That's true. But that's exactly what 8(c) does:
19	on: to take that a bit further, because eventually this	19	it's firm power only.
20	calculation leads to pondage, and then obviously the	20	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.
21	Treaty is clear on the fact that pondage is used to come	21	And then a last question related to this.
22	to daily and weekly load of a plant.	22	Irrespective of whether you consider this a load curve
23	So we see in pondage, there is a clear link to load.	23	or not, you can imagine the operator running a system
24	Given that this calculation leads to pondage, it seems	24	like this, for whatever purposes that you might have in
25	sensible to consider this as a function of load as well,	25	mind. In that case, one would consider the peak of this
	Page 93		Page 95
	rage 95		rage 95
12.10.1			
12:10 1	if only as a way that the plant eventually will be	12:12 1	curve, the maximum power that can be produced, which
2	operated.	2	would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that
2 3	operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which	2 3	would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to,
2 3 4	operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which	2 3 4	would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin,
2 3 4 5	operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's	2 3 4 5	would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity".
2 3 4 5 6	operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is	2 3 4 5 6	would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity".I would like to know whether you've got any view on
2 3 4 5 6 7	operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're	2 3 4 5 6 7	would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity".I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculation of pondage. And I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. But looking at the calculations which are presented 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculation of pondage. And I think going back to something that Sir Daniel said before, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. But looking at the calculations which are presented in the same annexure, it might even occur to me that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculation of pondage. And I think going back to something that Sir Daniel said before, the pondage here is calculated based on hydrology, rather
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. But looking at the calculations which are presented in the same annexure, it might even occur to me that this flow is never, or very rarely, present in the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculation of pondage. And I think going back to something that Sir Daniel said before, the pondage here is calculated based on hydrology, rather than based on the operation of the plant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. But looking at the calculations which are presented in the same annexure, it might even occur to me that this flow is never, or very rarely, present in the river. Which again from an engineering perspective 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculation of pondage. And I think going back to something that Sir Daniel said before, the pondage here is calculated based on hydrology, rather than based on the operation of the plant. DR MILES: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. But looking at the calculations which are presented in the same annexure, it might even occur to me that this flow is never, or very rarely, present in the river. Which again from an engineering perspective would seem a bit strange: that you optimise a system for 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculation of pondage. And I think going back to something that Sir Daniel said before, the pondage here is calculated based on hydrology, rather than based on the operation of the plant. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: Is it fair to say that that is the critical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. But looking at the calculations which are presented in the same annexure, it might even occur to me that this flow is never, or very rarely, present in the river. Which again from an engineering perspective would seem a bit strange: that you optimise a system for conditions which are virtually never, or perhaps even 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculation of pondage. And I think going back to something that Sir Daniel said before, the pondage here is calculated based on hydrology, rather than based on the operation of the plant. DR MINEAR: Is it fair to say that that is the critical distinction between India's position and Pakistan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. But looking at the calculations which are presented in the same annexure, it might even occur to me that this flow is never, or very rarely, present in the river. Which again from an engineering perspective would seem a bit strange: that you optimise a system for conditions which are virtually never, or perhaps even never, met. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculation of pondage. And I think going back to something that Sir Daniel said before, the pondage here is calculated based on hydrology, rather than based on the operation of the plant. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: Is it fair to say that that is the critical distinction between India's position and Pakistan's position? Not to say one or the other is right or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. But looking at the calculations which are presented in the same annexure, it might even occur to me that this flow is never, or very rarely, present in the river. Which again from an engineering perspective would seem a bit strange: that you optimise a system for conditions which are virtually never, or perhaps even never, met. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculated based on hydrology, rather than based on the operation of the plant. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: Is it fair to say that that is the critical distinction between India's position and Pakistan's position? Not to say one or the other is right or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 operated. DR MILES: Again, it's not something about the way in which the plant is going to be operated: it's the way in which the pondage is going to be stored. I mean, again, it's not something about the way in which energy or flow is going to be discharged; it's the way in which we're storing or using it. So again, I'm resistant to the idea of calling this a load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. As a follow-up question, you identify here that the optimum of your system is at a flow which is, I think, in this case 32 cubic metres a second, which is half of the minimum mean discharge. Again, from a hydrological perspective, that is a very low flow. I don't have the daily flow of the Kiru, I think, in this case. But looking at the calculations which are presented in the same annexure, it might even occur to me that this flow is never, or very rarely, present in the river. Which again from an engineering perspective would seem a bit strange: that you optimise a system for conditions which are virtually never, or perhaps even never, met. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 would be considered the firm capacity. And I think that the textbook which Sir Daniel mentioned or referred to, I think, back on Monday, Creager and Justin, specifically defined that as "firm capacity". I would like to know whether you've got any view on the relation between firm power and firm capacity. And I think that also comes back to my earlier question about the timeframe over which you look at the concept of firm power. DR MILES: That's something I think I'm going to have to consult on with colleagues. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, I think this colloquy helps to illustrate the distinction between India and Pakistan with regard to the calculation of pondage. And I think going back to something that Sir Daniel said before, the pondage here is calculated based on hydrology, rather than based on the operation of the plant. DR MILES: Yes. MR MINEAR: Is it fair to say that that is the critical distinction between India's position and Pakistan's position? Not to say one or the other is right or

		I	
12:14 1	is that a fair way to look at this problem?	12:16 1	exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power."
12.14 1	DR MILES: I think it is at a high level, yes. Pakistan's	12.10 1	You ask yourself then: well, what is "required for
	position is based on firm power which is based very	3	Firm Power"? And when you go to the definition of
3	clearly in the treaty on hydrology, and India's position	4	"Firm Power", you see it turns on the MMD at the plant.
	is based on the need to meet a load curve. So I think		
5		5	Wouldn't the simplest way to approach this and
6	that's really putting your finger right on, in point of	6	I understand that it's neither, I think, Pakistan's or
7	fact, what the difference between the parties is.	7	India's position, but I'd just like to hear a bit about
8	And this formulation that we present to you now	8	your thoughts on this.
9	as I was very resistant to the characterisation	9	DR MILES: Sure.
10	beforehand is dependent entirely on hydrology and	10	THE CHAIRMAN: The simplest way would be to take that MMD
11	nothing else.	11	which would be in a, I suppose, cubic-metre-per-second
12	MR MINEAR: I wonder if the term "firm power", introducing	12	volume, and you would, over, say, a course of a day,
13	that into this equation, causes a certain amount of	13	calculate how much total water would be generated by
14	confusion from Pakistan's position. We could be calling	14	that MMD if it was all put into pondage, and then that
15	this anything; but by referring to it as "firm power",	15	would be what is required for firm power, assuming
16	it keeps taking us back into traditional engineering	16	you're using exclusively pondage for running the
17	DR MILES: It does. I mean, you could call it the	17	turbines.
18	"designated rate" or something like that. I mean, the	18	In other words, that's a very simple way of
19	concept in contract law of a private dictionary which	19	interpreting what's meant in that paragraph 8(c), that
20	you occasionally find now, I'm not saying this is in	20	the pondage required for firm power is: if you had to
21	any way reflective of that; it's just an analogy. But	21	use just the pondage to run the plant, how much volume
22	a private dictionary in a contract would be: well, if	22	would you need to do that?
23	the parties say a dog is a cat, a dog is a cat.	23	DR MILES: So there's two for the defined time period,
24	MR MINEAR: Again, this is not to say that I've at all	24	I assume you mean?
25	decided what the correct position is here, but I'm	25	THE CHAIRMAN: For that 24-hour period, to run the turbines
	Page 97		Page 99
12:15 1	trying to discern what the difference is between the	12:18 1	
2	two parties with regard to what I think the critical	2	that.
2 3	two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power".	2 3	that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away
2 3 4	two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as	2 3 4	that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more.
2 3 4 5	two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power".DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by	2 3 4 5	that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying
2 3 4 5 6	two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power".DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately	2 3 4 5 6	that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours
2 3 4 5 6 7	two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power".DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that	2 3 4 5 6 7	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power".DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power".DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment.MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we should- be approaching it in sort of the simplest or the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility. DR MILES: Perhaps. I mean, I would also say: if what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we should- be approaching it in sort of the simplest or the easiest way to do a calculation. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility. DR MILES: Perhaps. I mean, I would also say: if what you're saying is sufficient pondage to produce 24 hours
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we should- be approaching it in sort of the simplest or the easiest way to do a calculation. DR MILES: Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility. DR MILES: Perhaps. I mean, I would also say: if what you're saying is sufficient pondage to produce 24 hours of firm power, I mean, that sort of is almost starting
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we should- be approaching it in sort of the simplest or the easiest way to do a calculation. DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that there is an even simpler 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility. DR MILES: Perhaps. I mean, I would also say: if what you're saying is sufficient pondage to produce 24 hours of firm power, I mean, that sort of is almost starting to talk about firm energy a bit, because you're talking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we should- be approaching it in sort of the simplest or the easiest way to do a calculation. DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that there is an even simpler way of doing this than what you've advocated here, which 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility. DR MILES: Perhaps. I mean, I would also say: if what you're saying is sufficient pondage to produce 24 hours of firm power, I mean, that sort of is almost starting to talk about firm energy a bit, because you're talking about power produced over a period of time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we should- be approaching it in sort of the simplest or the easiest way to do a calculation. DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that there is an even simpler way of doing this than what you've advocated here, which on some level is simple, on another level it's not, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility. DR MILES: Perhaps. I mean, I would also say: if what you're saying is sufficient pondage to produce 24 hours of firm power, I mean, that sort of is almost starting to talk about firm energy a bit, because you're talking about power produced over a period of time. But as I said, I'll reflect on it more, and I'll
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we should- be approaching it in sort of the simplest or the easiest way to do a calculation. DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that there is an even simpler way of doing this than what you've advocated here, which on some level is simple, on another level it's not, and that's that is to interpret paragraph 8(c) to say that: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility. DR MILES: Perhaps. I mean, I would also say: if what you're saying is sufficient pondage to produce 24 hours of firm power, I mean, that sort of is almost starting to talk about firm energy a bit, because you're talking about power produced over a period of time. But as I said, I'll reflect on it more, and I'll hopefully be able to come back at some point with a more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we should- be approaching it in sort of the simplest or the easiest way to do a calculation. DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that there is an even simpler way of doing this than what you've advocated here, which on some level is simple, on another level it's not, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility. DR MILES: Perhaps. I mean, I would also say: if what you're saying is sufficient pondage to produce 24 hours of firm power, I mean, that sort of is almost starting to talk about firm energy a bit, because you're talking about power produced over a period of time. But as I said, I'll reflect on it more, and I'll hopefully be able to come back at some point with a more
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 two parties with regard to what I think the critical language is here, "required for Firm Power". DR MILES: Exactly. And if I can pick up on that, and as we'll see in due course, the methodology put forward by India does not produce firm power. It deliberately doesn't produce firm power. But we'll come on to that in a moment. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr Miles, just because I don't think you'll be getting to this in the course of the remainder of your presentation, I want to ask you the following question. You've made a pitch that we should be approaching this in a daily context DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and you further made a pitch that we should- be approaching it in sort of the simplest or the easiest way to do a calculation. DR MILES: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that there is an even simpler way of doing this than what you've advocated here, which on some level is simple, on another level it's not, and that's that is to interpret paragraph 8(c) to say that: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 that. DR MILES: I've got two initial reactions, but I'll go away and think about it some more. My first reaction would be that if you're saying it's the pondage you need to it's basically 24 hours of inflow at the MMD level, is what you're talking about there. That would imply that the river is somehow running at zero, requiring 24 hours of MMD flow. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just to be clear, it would be an interpretation of what is meant in the Treaty. DR MILES: Understood. THE CHAIRMAN: There's all sorts of ways in which an engineer would not approach this from an efficiency standpoint, but in terms of the simplest way to understand what the Treaty is calling for, arguably that's one possibility. DR MILES: Perhaps. I mean, I would also say: if what you're saying is sufficient pondage to produce 24 hours of firm power, I mean, that sort of is almost starting to talk about firm energy a bit, because you're talking about power produced over a period of time. But as I said, I'll reflect on it more, and I'll hopefully be able to come back at some point with a more

12:19	that's helpful.	12:22 1	this point, and I appreciate the Court's helpful
	2 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you.	12.22 1	questions in this respect because they really do help
	Mr Minear.	3	sharpen the argument on the battlefield. It has taken
	MR MINEAR: Now that the Chair has opened the door to this	4	us this long because we've had to undertake
	-	5	a Treaty-interpretive exercise and then render it in
	6 divorce ourselves from engineering principles, to think	6	real-world terms.
	about this language.	7	But as a matter of mathematics, the equations
:		8	necessary to reach this curve are pretty
	this out for your reaction, I'm not endorsing it at	9	straightforward. Obviously Professor Buytaert has been
1		10	paying close attention to Appendix E2 of the Memorial
1		11	and, as he is aware and I'm sure you all are that
1	2 have, within that series, a river flow. So in other	12	sets out the equations over three or four pages, with
1	3 words, take I think the lowest number we have here is	13	a few explanatory notes. But if we wanted to, the same
1	36.6 cubic metres per second, and choose the difference	14	thing could be condensed to a single sheet of paper. So
1	5 between the minimum mean discharge and that lowest or	15	it really is, from an engineering perspective, dead
1	5 worst case scenario, and then do the same calculation	16	simple.
1	7 the Chair is talking about.	17	Now, returning to the main flow of my submissions,
1	3 I raise this just to get as you think about your	18	although this methodology may seem like it is generating
1	P reaction how do we deal with these other potential	19	a small quantity of pondage, it actually doesn't when we
2	approaches to dealing with this language, once we remove	20	remember that pondage, under paragraph 8(c), is not
2	ourselves from the engineering perspective that might be	21	intended to allow an Annexure D.3 HEP to generate power
2	2 brought, if we were to look not at hydrology but rather	22	at its installed capacity, but only at the firm power
2	at engineering principles for developing the pondage	23	rate.
2	4 level?	24	Now, obviously paragraph 8(c) doesn't restrict India
2	5 DR MILES: Yes. No, I see that. I mean, rather than sort	25	in its installed capacity, nor does any other provision
	Page 101		Page 103
	1 460 101		1450 105
12:20		12:23 1	of the Treaty. India can install whatever capacity into
	I think that is one that I'll have to go away and	12:23 1 2	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more
,	I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on.	2 3	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. 	2 3 4	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion.
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. 	2 3 4 5	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 	2 3 4 5 6	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm 	2 3 4 5 6 7	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day.
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way,
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most amount of firm power out of any sub-MMD flow rate, no 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce intermediate
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most amount of firm power out of any sub-MMD flow rate, no matter what the conditions are. This amount of pondage 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce intermediate firm power.
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most amount of firm power out of any sub-MMD flow rate, no matter what the conditions are. This amount of pondage will ensure that you will be able to generate meaningful 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce intermediate firm power. And at a flow rate of 33% of the MMD which really
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most amount of pirm power out of any sub-MMD flow rate, no matter what the conditions are. This amount of pondage will ensure that you will be able to generate meaningful firm power no matter what happens, even accepting as 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce intermediate firm power.
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most amount of pirm power out of any sub-MMD flow rate, no matter what the conditions are. This amount of pondage will ensure that you will be able to generate meaningful firm power no matter what happens, even accepting as Professor Buytaert did that from a statistical and 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce intermediate firm power. And at a flow rate of 33% of the MMD which really is very low when considering the wider hydrology of the Western Rivers, so low as to be a truly outlier
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most amount of firm power out of any sub-MMD flow rate, no matter what the conditions are. This amount of pondage will ensure that you will be able to generate meaningful firm power no matter what happens, even accepting as Professor Buytaert did that from a statistical and hydrological point of view, some of these numbers may be 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce intermediate firm power. And at a flow rate of 33% of the MMD which really is very low when considering the wider hydrology of the Western Rivers, so low as to be a truly outlier figure even below that, paragraph 8(c), on Pakistan's
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most amount of firm power out of any sub-MMD flow rate, no matter what the conditions are. This amount of pondage will ensure that you will be able to generate meaningful firm power no matter what happens, even accepting as Professor Buytaert did that from a statistical and hydrological point of view, some of these numbers may be less than likely. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce intermediate firm power. And at a flow rate of 33% of the MMD which really is very low when considering the wider hydrology of the Western Rivers, so low as to be a truly outlier
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most amount of firm power out of any sub-MMD flow rate, no matter what the conditions are. This amount of pondage will ensure that you will be able to generate meaningful firm power no matter what happens, even accepting as Professor Buytaert did that from a statistical and hydrological point of view, some of these numbers may be less than likely. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce intermediate firm power. And at a flow rate of 33% of the MMD which really is very low when considering the wider hydrology of the Western Rivers, so low as to be a truly outlier figure even below that, paragraph 8(c), on Pakistan's interpretation, is still going to give the Kiru HEP the capacity to peak for a meaningful duration at the firm
	 I think that is one that I'll have to go away and reflect on. MR MINEAR: Of course. DR MILES: But absolutely I'll do just that. Thank you. So the result always equals 12 hours of storage at 50% of the MMD, at least on Pakistan's formulation. I'm not entirely sure about the two alternatives that have now been presented. And as I've said previously, that inflection point coincides with the maximum usable pondage for daily regulation, and that's the greatest amount of pondage that could conceivably be required to enable passage-able inflow through the turbines at the MMD rate in a 24-hour period, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow in that period falls. And therefore, Pakistan says, that's the pondage required for firm power: you're going to get the most amount of firm power out of any sub-MMD flow rate, no matter what the conditions are. This amount of pondage will ensure that you will be able to generate meaningful firm power no matter what happens, even accepting as Professor Buytaert did that from a statistical and hydrological point of view, some of these numbers may be less than likely. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	an Annexure D.3 HEP it likes. Firm power, and more particularly the hydrology of the river, is merely the premise behind the paragraph 8(c) design criterion. (Slide 46) So back on the slide, we have for you the USACE breakdown of plant loadings. We've got baseload power, 24 hours a day; intermediate power, 8 to 14 hours a day; and peak load, which is less than 8 hours a day. So taking the numbers that we saw earlier for the Kiru HEP, if we've got a flow rate at 58.3% of the MMD or better I think that's, broadly speaking, around the numbers that Professor Buytaert was discussing the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce firm power at better than intermediate power. So it's going to get close to baseload in some cases; assuming, by the way, that the baseload is firm power. And for any flow rate between 33.3% of the MMD and 58.3% of the MMD, the Kiru HEP is going to be able to produce intermediate firm power. And at a flow rate of 33% of the MMD which really is very low when considering the wider hydrology of the Western Rivers, so low as to be a truly outlier figure even below that, paragraph 8(c), on Pakistan's interpretation, is still going to give the Kiru HEP the

12:24 1	power rate.	12:27 1 operate that operating pool in any way it sees fit;
2	Now, we don't have the daily data for Kiru on hand.	2 subject, of course, to the requirements of paragraph 15,
3	I think Pakistan does have it, but it's not in the	3 the operational criterion.
4	record. But we do have it for the site of the	4 So at 50% of the MMD, which is the figure that we've
5	Ratle HEP, which is further downstream on the Chenab.	5 selected, if India wants to store more than 12 hours of
6	And this data was provided to us under paragraph 9 of	6 inflow so as to produce power for a shorter period of
7	Annexure D when India first notified Pakistan that it	7 time at greater than firm power, or even at the HEP's
8	intended to develop the RHEP.	8 installed capacity, the doubling function will allow it
9	Now, looking at the entire historical record for	9 to do so. If India wants to keep back some water over
10	that site, we can see that in the entire 25 years of	10 the weekend to release for the Monday peak, consistent
10	that record, the lowest recorded available flow for any	11 with paragraph 15, the doubling function allows it to
11	24-hour period was 24.72 cubic metres a second.	12 do so.
12	When comparing that to the site's MMD of	13 How India produces power using its pondage is no
13	106.51 cubic metres a second, that's an astonishingly	14 business of Pakistan's. Indeed, India may use pondage
15	low 23% of the MMD. When we first looked at it, we	15 on days when inflow greater than MMD occurs, to store
16	considered there was a strong possibility that this	16 water to operate the HEP at full capacity during peaking
10	number was actually the result of an Indian data error.	17 hours. In that respect, the Treaty sets only the design
18	But nevertheless, applying the formula of	18 capacity of the operating pool, not its operational use,
19	paragraph 8(c) to this flow rate, it still allows the	19 provided that India complies with paragraph 15.
20	HEP built at that site to produce firm power for 5 hours	20 And indeed, we can see in this respect how
20	in any 24-hour period, having stored for 19 hours: more	21 paragraph 8(c) must exist as an essential balance to
21	than enough to meet at least one daily peak.	22 paragraph 15.
22	From this, we can see that paragraph 8(c) will	23 MR MINEAR: Dr Miles, sorry, once again, for interrupting
23	continue to give the HEP a meaningful amount of firm	24 your presentation.
24	power per 24-hour period in even the most adverse	25 I seem to recall that in the Kiru plant, India's
25	power per 24-nour period in even the most adverse	25 I seem to recail that in the Kiru plant, india s
	Page 105	Page 107
12:26 1	hydrological conditions. So this is by no means	12:29 1 calculation of the storage was around 10?
	nydrological conditions. So this is by no means	12.2) I calculation of the storage was around 10.
2	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And	2 DR MILES: I think so, 10.
2 3		_
	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And	2 DR MILES: I think so, 10.
3	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the	2 DR MILES: I think so, 10.3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what
3 4	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that $8(c)$ has set for us.	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that
3 4 5	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct?
3 4 5 6	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes.
3 4 5 6 7	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what 4 a little over three times what your level is; is that 5 correct? 6 DR MILES: Correct, yes. 7 MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that.
3 4 5 6 7 8	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres.	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what 4 a little over three times what your level is; is that 5 correct? 6 DR MILES: Correct, yes. 7 MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 9 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming 10 back to my question about how realistic, or how 11 frequently these conditions occur.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what 4 a little over three times what your level is; is that 5 correct? 6 DR MILES: Correct, yes. 7 MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 9 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming 10 back to my question about how realistic, or how 11 frequently these conditions occur. 12 If you look at the amount of pondage that results
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what 4 a little over three times what your level is; is that 5 correct? 6 DR MILES: Correct, yes. 7 MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 9 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming 10 back to my question about how realistic, or how 11 frequently these conditions occur. 12 If you look at the amount of pondage that results 13 from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what 4 a little over three times what your level is; is that 5 correct? 6 DR MILES: Correct, yes. 7 MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 9 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming 10 back to my question about how realistic, or how 11 frequently these conditions occur. 12 If you look at the amount of pondage that results 13 from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the 14 typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what 4 a little over three times what your level is; is that 5 correct? 6 DR MILES: Correct, yes. 7 MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 9 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming 10 back to my question about how realistic, or how 11 frequently these conditions occur. 12 If you look at the amount of pondage that results 13 from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the 14 typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum 15 mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what 4 a little over three times what your level is; is that 5 correct? 6 DR MILES: Correct, yes. 7 MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 9 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming 10 back to my question about how realistic, or how 11 frequently these conditions occur. 12 If you look at the amount of pondage that results 13 from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the 14 typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum 15 mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 16 would be relevant. Because it states a range from,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming back to my question about how realistic, or how frequently these conditions occur. If you look at the amount of pondage that results from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, I think, 30% to 130%.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres.	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming back to my question about how realistic, or how frequently these conditions occur. If you look at the amount of pondage that results from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, I think, 30% to 130%. Do you have any appreciation of how often the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres. So what this doubling function of paragraph 8 does	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what 4 a little over three times what your level is; is that 5 correct? 6 DR MILES: Correct, yes. 7 MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 9 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming 10 back to my question about how realistic, or how 11 frequently these conditions occur. 12 If you look at the amount of pondage that results 13 from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the 14 typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum 15 mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 16 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, 17 I think, 30% to 130%. 18 Do you have any appreciation of how often the 19 situation would occur, given that amount of pondage,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres. So what this doubling function of paragraph 8 does is to provide our Indian HEP with significant headroom	 2 DR MILES: I think so, 10. 3 MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what 4 a little over three times what your level is; is that 5 correct? 6 DR MILES: Correct, yes. 7 MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 9 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming 10 back to my question about how realistic, or how 11 frequently these conditions occur. 12 If you look at the amount of pondage that results 13 from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the 14 typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum 15 mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 16 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, 17 I think, 30% to 130%. 18 Do you have any appreciation of how often the 19 situation would occur, given that amount of pondage, 20 that actually India would be in a position to release
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres. So what this doubling function of paragraph 8 does is to provide our Indian HEP with significant headroom as an operational matter.	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming back to my question about how realistic, or how frequently these conditions occur. If you look at the amount of pondage that results from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, I think, 30% to 130%. Do you have any appreciation of how often the situation would occur, given that amount of pondage, that actually India would be in a position to release less than 30%? Because essentially that means that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres. So what this doubling function of paragraph 8 does is to provide our Indian HEP with significant headroom as an operational matter. So recall in this respect that paragraph 8(c) is	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming back to my question about how realistic, or how frequently these conditions occur. If you look at the amount of pondage that results from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, I think, 30% to 130%. Do you have any appreciation of how often the situation would occur, given that amount of pondage, that actually India would be in a position to release less than 30%? Because essentially that means that it can maintain 70%. I think that the total pondage
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres. So what this doubling function of paragraph 8 does is to provide our Indian HEP with significant headroom as an operational matter. So recall in this respect that paragraph 8(c) is only a design criterion; it doesn't govern the operation	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming back to my question about how realistic, or how frequently these conditions occur. If you look at the amount of pondage that results from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, I think, 30% to 130%. Do you have any appreciation of how often the situation would occur, given that amount of pondage, that actually India would be in a position to release less than 30%? Because essentially that means that it can maintain 70%. I think that the total pondage
$ \begin{array}{c} 3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres. So what this doubling function of paragraph 8 does is to provide our Indian HEP with significant headroom as an operational matter. So recall in this respect that paragraph 8(c) is only a design criterion; it doesn't govern the operation of the HEP. But once the volume of the operating pool	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming back to my question about how realistic, or how frequently these conditions occur. If you look at the amount of pondage that results from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, I think, 30% to 130%. Do you have any appreciation of how often the situation would occur, given that amount of pondage, that actually India would be in a position to release less than 30%? Because essentially that means that it can maintain 70%. I think that the total pondage that results from Pakistan's calculation is about 50% of the mean minimum discharge. So that means that even in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres. So what this doubling function of paragraph 8 does is to provide our Indian HEP with significant headroom as an operational matter. So recall in this respect that paragraph 8(c) is only a design criterion; it doesn't govern the operation	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming back to my question about how realistic, or how frequently these conditions occur. If you look at the amount of pondage that results from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, I think, 30% to 130%. Do you have any appreciation of how often the situation would occur, given that amount of pondage, that actually India would be in a position to release less than 30%? Because essentially that means that it can maintain 70%. I think that the total pondage
$ \begin{array}{c} 3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres. So what this doubling function of paragraph 8 does is to provide our Indian HEP with significant headroom as an operational matter. So recall in this respect that paragraph 8(c) is only a design criterion; it doesn't govern the operation of the HEP. But once the volume of the operating pool is fixed in accordance with its requirements, India may	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming back to my question about how realistic, or how frequently these conditions occur. If you look at the amount of pondage that results from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, I think, 30% to 130%. Do you have any appreciation of how often the situation would occur, given that amount of pondage, that actually India would be in a position to release less than 30%? Because essentially that means that it can maintain 70%. I think that the total pondage that results from Pakistan's calculation is about 50% of the mean minimum discharge. So that means that even in conditions of the mean minimum discharge, there would
$ \begin{array}{c} 3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	unreasonable, in terms of firm power production. And that reasonableness is confirmed when we complete the task that 8(c) has set for us. (Slide 47) If we recall, the provision doesn't provide that the maximum pondage in the operating pool shall be the pondage required for firm power: it's going to be "twice the pondage required for Firm Power". So we're going to take our figure and we're going to double it. And this means that the maximum pondage for the 624 MW Kiru HEP is 2.82 million cubic metres. Now, again, this is by no means ungenerous. By way of rough approximation, when we consider the NJHEP, one of the most significant HEPs in Pakistan's grid, with a much larger installed capacity of 969 MW, it is fulfilling the function that the power system operator requires of it with an operating pool of only 3.8 million cubic metres. So what this doubling function of paragraph 8 does is to provide our Indian HEP with significant headroom as an operational matter. So recall in this respect that paragraph 8(c) is only a design criterion; it doesn't govern the operation of the HEP. But once the volume of the operating pool	 DR MILES: I think so, 10. MR MINEAR: Yes. So that's about four times what a little over three times what your level is; is that correct? DR MILES: Correct, yes. MR MINEAR: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Picking up on paragraph 15, and coming back to my question about how realistic, or how frequently these conditions occur. If you look at the amount of pondage that results from the calculation of Pakistan and compare that to the typical flow, or even low flows, including the minimum mean discharge, I wonder how often actually paragraph 15 would be relevant. Because it states a range from, I think, 30% to 130%. Do you have any appreciation of how often the situation would occur, given that amount of pondage, that actually India would be in a position to release less than 30%? Because essentially that means that it can maintain 70%. I think that the total pondage that results from Pakistan's calculation is about 50% of the mean minimum discharge. So that means that even in

12:30 1	not be a way that India can store sufficient water to	12:33 1	falls. And as shown previously, this will inevitably be
2	release less than 30% in a day.	2	the volume equivalent to 12 hours of storage at 50% of
3	So I wonder if you already need to go the flow	3	the MMD flow rate. Any additional storage cannot
4	need to drop considerably below the minimum mean	4	increase the amount of time the HEP spends producing
5	discharge to have a pondage that's sufficient to invoke	5	firm power in the course of a 24-hour period, and is
6	the limitations of paragraph 15. And not having access	6	therefore redundant.
7	to the original data, I wouldn't be surprised if it	7	And third, once you've done that, you're going to
8	actually hardly ever will occur. That makes me wonder	8	double the figure so obtained to determine the maximum
9	to which extent the calculations proposed by Pakistan	9	pondage, and thus the volume of the operating pool.
10	might even make paragraph 15 largely redundant.	10	(Slide 49) I'll draw a line now under this part of
11	DR MILES: I will say that paragraph 15 is an operational	11	my remarks by summarising the benefits of what, in
12	requirement; it's not a design criterion. But I'll	12	Pakistan's submission, is the proper reading of
13	discuss with colleagues and I'll revert to you, because	13	paragraph 8(c). And there's three of them.
14	that's quite a complicated question.	14	First and foremost, Pakistan's approach complies
15	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.	15	with the scheme, letter and spirit of the Treaty. It's
16	DR MILES: Just to go back.	16	rooted in the critical provisions of paragraph 8(c) and
17	So paragraph 15, as you've mentioned, represents the	17	2(i) of Annexure D. It understands that paragraph 8(c),
18	essential day-to-day limitation on India's HEP	18	situated as it is within Annexure D, is an exception to
19	operations on the Western Rivers, reflecting both the	19	the controlling principles of let flow and no storage
20	let-flow requirement of Article III(2) and the suspicion	20	contained in Articles III(2) and (4). And it provides
21	of storage in Article III(4). And it applies all year	21	an essential check on India's hydropower operations on
22	round, in dry season and in wet, irrespective of	22	the Western Rivers, ensuring that if India does step
23	hydrological conditions.	23	outside the boundaries of paragraph 15 of Annexure D on
24	When we consider it carefully, we see that	24	the Western Rivers, the damage to Pakistan caused
25	paragraph 15 sets down an ordinance for the operation of	25	thereby is limited by the relatively compact operating
	Page 109		Page 111
12:32 1	the operating pool of an Annexure D.3 HEP only. The	12:34 1	pools of its HEPs.
12:32 1 2	the operating pool of an Annexure D.3 HEP only. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think	12:34 1 2	pools of its HEPs. Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while
			-
2	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think	2	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while
2 3	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on	2 3	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm
2 3 4	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all,	2 3 4	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then
2 3 4 5	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge	2 3 4 5	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional
2 3 4 5 6	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and	2 3 4 5 6	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of
2 3 4 5 6 7	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away	2 3 4 5 6 7	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D and the historical daily 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct methodology.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D and the historical daily data that India is required to provide under Appendix II 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct methodology. It results in a figure that does not require
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D and the historical daily data that India is required to provide under Appendix II to Annexure D. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct methodology. It results in a figure that does not require constant correction and cannot be rendered unfit for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D and the historical daily data that India is required to provide under Appendix II to Annexure D. Second, determine the pondage "required for Firm 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct methodology. It results in a figure that does not require constant correction and cannot be rendered unfit for purpose by future developments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D and the historical daily data that India is required to provide under Appendix II to Annexure D. Second, determine the pondage "required for Firm Power", being the pondage required to allow 24 hours of 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct methodology. It results in a figure that does not require constant correction and cannot be rendered unfit for purpose by future developments. And it generates a result that, because of the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D and the historical daily data that India is required to provide under Appendix II to Annexure D. Second, determine the pondage "required for Firm Power", being the pondage required to allow 24 hours of sub-MMD flow to be passed through the turbines at the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct methodology. It results in a figure that does not require constant correction and cannot be rendered unfit for purpose by future developments. And it generates a result that, because of the averaging process of MMD calculation, is not overly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D and the historical daily data that India is required to provide under Appendix II to Annexure D. Second, determine the pondage "required for Firm Power", being the pondage required to allow 24 hours of 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct methodology. It results in a figure that does not require constant correction and cannot be rendered unfit for purpose by future developments. And it generates a result that, because of the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D and the historical daily data that India is required to provide under Appendix II to Annexure D. Second, determine the pondage "required for Firm Power", being the pondage required to allow 24 hours of sub-MMD flow to be passed through the turbines at the MMD rate, irrespective of how far below the MMD the flow 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct methodology. It results in a figure that does not require constant correction and cannot be rendered unfit for purpose by future developments. And it generates a result that, because of the averaging process of MMD calculation, is not overly sensitive to individual values in the input data.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all and I think this is the point that Professor Buytaert was getting on to. The HEP's dead storage cannot be used at all, whilst the only other form of live storage is surcharge storage, which is considered temporary and uncontrollable floodwater storage, which will drain away downstream as the flood recedes. Paragraph 8(c) therefore ensures that if India does violate the provisions of paragraph 15, storing or discharging more water than the applicable schedule dictates, then any damage caused thereby is limited by ensuring that the operating pool is kept relatively small. (Slide 48) So, pulling the threads together, on Pakistan's formulation, we see that paragraph 8(c) essentially requires a three-step process. First, calculate the MMD for the HEP site using paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D and the historical daily data that India is required to provide under Appendix II to Annexure D. Second, determine the pondage "required for Firm Power", being the pondage required to allow 24 hours of sub-MMD flow to be passed through the turbines at the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 Second, it achieves this Treaty compliance while still providing India with a meaningful amount of firm power for each 24-hour period, which amount is then doubled to allow India to give its HEPs additional operational flexibility, within the framework of paragraph 15. And third, it complies with each of the sufficiency criteria that I took you to earlier. Just to make that point good, those are also on the slide. We can now see there that Pakistan's approach to paragraph 8(c) results in a clear and unique volume of maximum pondage for each Annexure D.3 HEP, derived solely from the MMD of the HEP in question. It can be easily deployed using tools that would have been available to the drafters of the Treaty in 1960, so manual or graphical means with minimal use of calculation, avoiding disagreements as to the correct methodology. It results in a figure that does not require constant correction and cannot be rendered unfit for purpose by future developments. And it generates a result that, because of the averaging process of MMD calculation, is not overly

12:36	Because those values are averaged over many years,	12:38 1 a hydroelectric plant.
12.00	 2 errors or outliers in any one year will not affect the 	2 DR MILES: Yes, but it's not what India does, is the point.
	result significantly, forestalling further disagreement.	3 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. That's, I guess, a different
	4 It doesn't require yes, Professor Buytaert.	4 thing. I just wanted you to clarify this point.
	5 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Sorry. I just want to pick up on the	5 DR MILES: Sorry, I'm not meaning to say that obviously
	6 point 3 you mention here, where you say it "Does not	6 if there was a methodology for the calculation of
	 require constant correction". 	pondage that did what would ordinarily happen, which is,
	8 Could you perhaps elaborate on what reasons you	8 "Okay, where are we going to be in 25 years' time, over
	9 could see for the need for correction?	9 the lifetime of the plant?", that's not something that
	0 DR MILES: I'll give you the answer now, and you'll see it	10 would require constant correction, right? But
	1 more when it comes on to India's case.	11 ultimately also this is only one of six efficiency
	2 If, for example, you were to premise pondage	12 criteria, so you've also got the other five to deal
	3 calculation on the basis of a load curve at a particular	13 with. But I take your point entirely.
	4 point in time, and the load curve then changes, suddenly	14 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. I wanted to make sure
	5 this thing is not going to be fit for purpose and it's	15 I was clear on this one. Thank you.
	6 going to require some correction. So that's more what	16 DR MILES: You were exceptionally clear.
1	7 I had in mind. So that's obviously not a problem on	17 SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, perhaps I might just intercede for
1	8 Pakistan's methodology, because we're based on	18 a moment. It's obviously not on the issues of substance
1	9 hydrology, but it is a problem for India's. And I'll	19 that Dr Miles is dealing with. I'm just a little bit
2	0 come on to that in due course.	20 concerned that we're going to become exceptionally
2	1 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But then an engineer might argue that	21 stressed for time.
2	2 accounting for future changes in the load curve is	22 We very much welcome the questions from the Court,
2	3 standard practice; indeed, it's something you would do	both because it's testing our hypothesis and because it
2	4 when you would design a hydroelectric plant outside of	24 will give us the gruel that we need to address in the
2	5 the Treaty. So it kind of assumes that an engineer	second round. If Dr Miles does not finish by 1 o'clock,
	Page 113	Page 115
12:37		12:39 1 we are going to have problems. So I wonder whether
12:37	2 changes in the load curve.	2 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should
12:37	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them
12:37	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get
12:37	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda.
12:37	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel.
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are
1	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that
1	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly.
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on the basis of a particular month in a particular year, 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do want the members to feel free to engage in their
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on the basis of a particular month in a particular year, that's going to require correction. If what you're 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do want the members to feel free to engage in their questions, because I do think we have several.
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on the basis of a particular month in a particular year, that's going to require correction. If what you're doing is you're forecasting on the basis of a wider, 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do want the members to feel free to engage in their questions, because I do think we have several. So, Dr Miles, why don't you proceed.
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on the basis of a particular month in a particular year, that's going to require correction. If what you're doing is you're forecasting on the basis of a wider, more foreseeing sort of "25 years in advance, what's the 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do want the members to feel free to engage in their questions, because I do think we have several. So, Dr Miles, why don't you proceed. DR MILES: (Slide 50) I'm now moving on to India's approach
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on the basis of a particular month in a particular year, that's going to require correction. If what you're doing is you're forecasting on the basis of a wider, more foreseeing sort of "25 years in advance, what's the position going to be?" kind of situation, that would be 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do want the members to feel free to engage in their questions, because I do think we have several. So, Dr Miles, why don't you proceed. DR MILES: (Slide 50) I'm now moving on to India's approach to this. So that closes, for now, the book on
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on the basis of a particular month in a particular year, that's going to require correction. If what you're doing is you're forecasting on the basis of a wider, more foreseeing sort of "25 years in advance, what's the position going to be?" kind of situation, that would be different. 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do want the members to feel free to engage in their questions, because I do think we have several. So, Dr Miles, why don't you proceed. DR MILES: (Slide 50) I'm now moving on to India's approach to this. So that closes, for now, the book on Pakistan's approach, and now we're going to have a look
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on the basis of a particular month in a particular year, that's going to require correction. If what you're doing is you're forecasting on the basis of a wider, more foreseeing sort of "25 years in advance, what's the position going to be?" kind of situation, that would be different. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Well, eventually I would think that 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do want the members to feel free to engage in their questions, because I do think we have several. So, Dr Miles, why don't you proceed. DR MILES: (Slide 50) I'm now moving on to India's approach to this. So that closes, for now, the book on Pakistan's approach, and now we're going to have a look at what India is actually doing.
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on the basis of a particular month in a particular year, that's going to require correction. If what you're doing is you're forecasting on the basis of a wider, more foreseeing sort of "25 years in advance, what's the position going to be?" kind of situation, that would be different. 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do want the members to feel free to engage in their questions, because I do think we have several. So, Dr Miles, why don't you proceed. DR MILES: (Slide 50) I'm now moving on to India's approach to this. So that closes, for now, the book on Pakistan's approach, and now we're going to have a look
	 changes in the load curve. DR MILES: It depends on which load curve, and I'll come on to that in due course. There's a difference I'll give you the answer now. There's a difference between a load curve provided for a particular month in a particular year and a 25-year forecast, for example, of what the power system is likely to do over time. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But again, one would argue that given the lifespan of a hydropower plant and the fact that they are incorporated in an electric grid, that's exactly part of the design of a hydroelectric plant: making a forecast of changes in demand, and designing a plant such that it remains relevant and optimal during its entire lifetime. DR MILES: I understand that. But again, the question is: which load curve? If you were fixing a load curve on the basis of a particular month in a particular year, that's going to require correction. If what you're doing is you're forecasting on the basis of a wider, more foreseeing sort of "25 years in advance, what's the position going to be?" kind of situation, that would be different. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Well, eventually I would think that 	 and maybe this is a direction to Dr Miles he should take the questions that we welcome, but then defer them to a second round, because otherwise we will not get through our agenda. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I do think the questions are important. I suppose I would also note that the members of the Court have read the Memorial very carefully and all of us are familiar with the various figures within it, such that to the extent Dr Miles is able to go more quickly through some of his discussion, I think he should feel free to do that. I do realise you're now moving on to aspects that weren't necessarily in the Memorial, so therefore it may not be possible to move more quickly. But I think we need to continue as we are, bearing in mind the concern we may have with time. But I do want the members to feel free to engage in their questions, because I do think we have several. So, Dr Miles, why don't you proceed. DR MILES: (Slide 50) I'm now moving on to India's approach to this. So that closes, for now, the book on Pakistan's approach, and now we're going to have a look at what India is actually doing.

12:41 1	the question of the calculation of pondage under	12:43 1	foundation of his approach to pondage. And in 6.5, he
12.41 1	Annexure D one hesitates to say "under	12.45 1	takes those general considerations and applies them to
2	paragraph 8(c)" and has argued that the approach	23	the specific case of the Baglihar HEP.
	taken by the Neutral Expert in Baglihar was correct.		(Slide 53) So let's start with what Professor
4		4	
5	(Slide 51) So we've got an example from the	5	Lafitte did, which is a discussion of the reason for
6	correspondence between the Commissioners, which might be	6	pondage as a general matter. Broadly speaking,
7	thought to be the high-water mark of India's attitude,	7	I suppose that this could be considered correct. And
8	and the correspondence is from 21 August 2015 (P-16).	8	while this discussion is very interesting as a legal
9	You can see there the principle of the calculation of	9	matter, it's relevant only as a point of distinction
10	pondage was raised and addressed by the Neutral Expert	10	with the approach under the Treaty that it has put in
11	in Baglihar.	11	place. So the Treaty has a special understanding of the
12	So India's approach is that Baglihar is correct	12	way in which pondage is calculated.
13	and as may be seen perhaps from the statement that	13	(Slide 54) On the slide, we see the commencement of
14	we see in the letter here binding on the parties more	14	Professor Lafitte's examination of the Treaty provisions
15	generally. And you've already been addressed by	15	themselves. And he starts with the provisions of
16	Mr Fietta on why that proposition is wrong.	16	Annexure D, specifically the definition of "Pondage" in
17	But nevertheless, India's position is that the	17	paragraph 2(c) and the design criteria that govern its
18	Baglihar position, even if not binding, on the	18	calculations in paragraph 8(c).
19	calculation of pondage under Annexure D is correct, and:	19	Now, an initial point of difficulty here: this is
20	" serv[es] as a template to achieve quicker and	20	not, in Pakistan's submission, the correct starting
21	amicable resolution in the Commission itself in	21	point. The correct starting point is Article III, which
22	an expeditious manner."	22	establishes Pakistan's exclusive right to the waters of
23	Now, in Pakistan's submission, India's reliance on	23	the Western Rivers, and casts everything in Annexure D
24	the Baglihar approach as being in any way authoritative	24	as a closely limited exception. And this is not an idle
25	is misguided. If I can be blunt, the Neutral Expert in	25	point because without the context, the provisions of
	D 445		D
	Page 117		Page 119
12:42 1	that proceeding was completely wrong as to his	1	Annexure D and perhaps especially these ones
12:42 1 2	that proceeding was completely wrong as to his determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making	1 2	Annexure D and perhaps especially these ones cannot be properly understood.
2	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making	2	cannot be properly understood.
2 3	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties'	2 3	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the
2 3 4	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly	2 3 4	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2):
2 3 4 5	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years.	2 3 4 5	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that
2 3 4 5 6	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the	2 3 4 5 6	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily
2 3 4 5 6 7	 determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly 	2 3 4 5 6 7	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be binding in the future.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the power produced to meet daily and weekly load variations,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be binding in the future. With that introduction, I turn now to demonstrate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the power produced to meet daily and weekly load variations, which could be up to and including the HEP's installed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be binding in the future. With that introduction, I turn now to demonstrate why, given the clear provisions of the Treaty, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the power produced to meet daily and weekly load variations, which could be up to and including the HEP's installed capacity.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be binding in the future. With that introduction, I turn now to demonstrate why, given the clear provisions of the Treaty, the Baglihar approach to the determination of maximum	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the power produced to meet daily and weekly load variations, which could be up to and including the HEP's installed capacity. So what Professor Lafitte seems to have done is to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be binding in the future. With that introduction, I turn now to demonstrate why, given the clear provisions of the Treaty, the Baglihar approach to the determination of maximum pondage cannot be correct, and indeed produces dangerous results that, if widely accepted, would endanger the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the power produced to meet daily and weekly load variations, which could be up to and including the HEP's installed capacity. So what Professor Lafitte seems to have done is to elevate paragraph 8(c) effectively out of Annexure D. And
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be binding in the future. With that introduction, I turn now to demonstrate why, given the clear provisions of the Treaty, the Baglihar approach to the determination of maximum pondage cannot be correct, and indeed produces dangerous	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the power produced to meet daily and weekly load variations, which could be up to and including the HEP's installed capacity. So what Professor Lafitte seems to have done is to elevate paragraph 2(c) to the criterion of design, and
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be binding in the future. With that introduction, I turn now to demonstrate why, given the clear provisions of the Treaty, the Baglihar approach to the determination of maximum pondage cannot be correct, and indeed produces dangerous results that, if widely accepted, would endanger the fabric of the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the power produced to meet daily and weekly load variations, which could be up to and including the HEP's installed capacity. So what Professor Lafitte seems to have done is to elevate paragraph 2(c) to the criterion of design, and read paragraph 8(c) effectively out of Annexure D. And the same goes for paragraph 2(i), which provides the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be binding in the future. With that introduction, I turn now to demonstrate why, given the clear provisions of the Treaty, the Baglihar approach to the determination of maximum pondage cannot be correct, and indeed produces dangerous results that, if widely accepted, would endanger the fabric of the Treaty. (Slide 52) In Baglihar, we see on the slide, it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the power produced to meet daily and weekly load variations, which could be up to and including the HEP's installed capacity. So what Professor Lafitte seems to have done is to elevate paragraph 2(c) to the criterion of design, and read paragraph 8(c) effectively out of Annexure D. And the same goes for paragraph 2(i), which provides the definition of "Firm Power" and pegs it to the MMD.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	determination of pondage for that HEP. And in making the finding that he did, he has blown the parties' interactions on this issue off course for nearly 20 years. The Court in this respect will have in mind the words of Professor Briscoe of Harvard, an avowedly disinterested observer, who in 2010 observed that the Neutral Expert's determination "gutted the [Treaty] of its essential balance". That's at P-0326. While it is too late for Professor Lafitte's mistake to be reversed, Pakistan asks this Court to as its predecessor did find that his conclusions on the calculation of pondage are wrong, and to make a further finding as to the correct approach to this that will be binding in the future. With that introduction, I turn now to demonstrate why, given the clear provisions of the Treaty, the Baglihar approach to the determination of maximum pondage cannot be correct, and indeed produces dangerous results that, if widely accepted, would endanger the fabric of the Treaty. (Slide 52) In Baglihar, we see on the slide, it's discussed in two places: 5.9 and 6.5. And in 5.9, he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cannot be properly understood. In the following paragraphs, we see where the trouble begins (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "With these two provisions the Treaty specifies that the pondage volume should be calculated to satisfy daily or weekly load variations of the plant and consequently the variations in the turbine discharge necessary to produce this variable demand of power." With the greatest of respect, it does not. The Treaty specifies (Annexure D, paragraph 8(c)) that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." Firm power, as we know, is the power produced by the HEP when the river flows at the MMD level. It's not the power produced to meet daily and weekly load variations, which could be up to and including the HEP's installed capacity. So what Professor Lafitte seems to have done is to elevate paragraph 2(c) to the criterion of design, and read paragraph 8(c) effectively out of Annexure D. And the same goes for paragraph 2(i), which provides the definition of "Firm Power" and pegs it to the MMD. He seems also to have misread paragraph 2(c). As

12:46 1	" of only sufficient magnitude to meet	12:48 1	And then we see the provisions of paragraph 15.
2	[variations] in [turbine] discharge"	2	He says:
3	Properly interpreted, it is not an enabling	3	"This means that the plant could turbine, during one
4	provision: it is another limitation. And the role of	4	day, a discharge which is different from the river
5	that limitation is plain when it's tied together with	5	inflow, but not lower than 50% and not higher than 130%;
6	paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i).	6	consequently the power of the plant could vary."
7	The basic rule, per paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i), is	7	Now, this is true and accurate. But what
8	that maximum pondage is twice that required for firm	8	Professor Lafitte does not do is explain why that's
9	power. This sets a basic and objective parameter for	9	relevant to the calculation of pondage. Paragraph 15 is
10	the size of the operating pool. But within that	10	an operational criterion, not a design criterion, and
11	parameter, 2(c) seems to be providing an additional	11	appears nowhere in paragraph (c).
12	limitation, which is that India is entitled to pondage	12	But we can see why Professor Lafitte felt the need
13	of only sufficient magnitude to meet variations in	13	to reach for this. If he is right that pondage is to be
14	turbine discharge. If this quantity is less than that	14	calculated to meet fluctuations in turbine discharge,
15	required for firm power, India must reduce its pondage	15	then the operational criterion of paragraph 15 is the
16	again to meet that further limitation.	16	only conceivable limitation on pondage because India is
17	Again, this is wholly unsurprising when the wider	17	the one that's setting the turbine discharge. So as
18	Treaty is considered. Pakistan is entitled to exclusive	18	a consequence, paragraph 15 must be shoehorned into the
19	use of the waters of the Western Rivers.	19	design phase to prevent India from having the ability to
20	So one can see why this would be a relatively useful	20	set unilaterally the live storage of its HEPs, contrary
21	limitation in the case where we have a HEP with	21	to Pakistan's interests.
22	a relatively small installed capacity, in an area with	22	Again, this makes no sense as a matter of Treaty
23	a relatively high MMD. So the pondage required for firm	23	interpretation, and could be avoided if paragraph 8(c)
24	power in such a case could be relatively large: more	24	is properly interpreted.
25	than would ordinarily be needed given the HEP's	25	And moreover, it misunderstands the relationship
	Page 121		Page 123
12:47 1	installed capacity and the load placed upon it by India.	12:49 1	between paragraph 15 and paragraph 8(c). Paragraph 15
	installed capacity and the load placed upon it by India. And so it would make sense, in light of the overall		between paragraph 15 and paragraph 8(c). Paragraph 15 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is
12:47 1 2 3	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall	12:49 1 2 3	between paragraph 15 and paragraph 8(c). Paragraph 15 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates
2 3	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by	2	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates
2	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall	2 3	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the
2 3 4 5	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations.	2 3 4 5	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which
2 3 4 5 6	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach	2 3 4 5 6	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset,
2 3 4 5 6 7	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by	2 3 4 5 6 7	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused.
2 3 4 5 6 7	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by	2 3 4 5 6 7	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3).
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does. Paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) provide that the pondage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes a special meaning for the term in accordance with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does. Paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) provide that the pondage required for firm power is the live storage required to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes a special meaning for the term in accordance with Article 31(4); rather, he refers to a completely
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does. Paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) provide that the pondage required for firm power is the live storage required to supplement the river to the MMD level. Pondage is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes a special meaning for the term in accordance with Article 31(4); rather, he refers to a completely irrelevant definition from the American Society of Civil
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does. Paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) provide that the pondage required for firm power is the live storage required to supplement the river to the MMD level. Pondage is required, therefore, to even out a variable that is	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes a special meaning for the term in accordance with Article 31(4); rather, he refers to a completely irrelevant definition from the American Society of Civil Engineers.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does. Paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) provide that the pondage required for firm power is the live storage required to supplement the river to the MMD level. Pondage is required, therefore, to even out a variable that is to say fluctuating sub-MMD inflow.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes a special meaning for the term in accordance with Article 31(4); rather, he refers to a completely irrelevant definition from the American Society of Civil Engineers. He then highlights, after that, that firm power can
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does. Paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) provide that the pondage required for firm power is the live storage required to supplement the river to the MMD level. Pondage is required, therefore, to even out a variable that is to say fluctuating sub-MMD inflow. Professor Lafitte continues:	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes a special meaning for the term in accordance with Article 31(4); rather, he refers to a completely irrelevant definition from the American Society of Civil Engineers. He then highlights, after that, that firm power can be base or peak power under this definition. Again,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does. Paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) provide that the pondage required for firm power is the live storage required to supplement the river to the MMD level. Pondage is required, therefore, to even out a variable that is to say fluctuating sub-MMD inflow. Professor Lafitte continues: "This is confirmed by the Treaty which fixes the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes a special meaning for the term in accordance with Article 31(4); rather, he refers to a completely irrelevant definition from the American Society of Civil Engineers. He then highlights, after that, that firm power can be base or peak power under this definition. Again, that's irrelevant: it's a rate of power production.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does. Paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) provide that the pondage required for firm power is the live storage required to supplement the river to the MMD level. Pondage is required, therefore, to even out a variable that is to say fluctuating sub-MMD inflow. Professor Lafitte continues: "This is confirmed by the Treaty which fixes the limitation of India's use of water from the Western Rivers. According to Annexure D Paragraph 15"	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes a special meaning for the term in accordance with Article 31(4); rather, he refers to a completely irrelevant definition from the American Society of Civil Engineers. He then highlights, after that, that firm power can be base or peak power under this definition. Again, that's irrelevant: it's a rate of power production. And then he turns to the definition of "Firm Power" in the Treaty itself, and goes on to calculate correctly
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	And so it would make sense, in light of the overall mission of Article III, to limit India further by reference to what was only sufficient to meet turbine variations. (Slide 55) Insofar as showing why India's approach is wrong, I could stop there. This initial error by Professor Lafitte renders the rest of the analysis incorrect. I'm afraid, though, further errors were made, and we can see these on the slide. Starting off (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.2): "An important matter to be stressed is that the Treaty does not say that 'Pondage' means Live Storage of only sufficient magnitude to meet the fluctuations of the daily and weekly inflow of Chenab river." Again, with the greatest respect, yes, it does. Paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) provide that the pondage required for firm power is the live storage required to supplement the river to the MMD level. Pondage is required, therefore, to even out a variable that is to say fluctuating sub-MMD inflow. Professor Lafitte continues: "This is confirmed by the Treaty which fixes the limitation of India's use of water from the Western	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	is not a limitation on 8(c). Rather, paragraph 8(c) is a design guarantee that provides that if India violates the operational limitations of paragraph 15, the operating pools of the HEPs in respect of which paragraph 15 is violated are kept small from the outset, so as to limit the volume of water stored and, thereby, the damage caused. (Slide 56) Professor Lafitte did refer eventually to the definition of "Firm Power", but he didn't do so in the section titled "Determination of pondage". And again, we have the relevant passage on the slide (PLA-2, paragraph 5.9.3). The starting point here is again problematic, with Professor Lafitte referring not to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i), which establishes a special meaning for the term in accordance with Article 31(4); rather, he refers to a completely irrelevant definition from the American Society of Civil Engineers. He then highlights, after that, that firm power can be base or peak power under this definition. Again, that's irrelevant: it's a rate of power production. And then he turns to the definition of "Firm Power"

12:50 1	for Baglihar at 131 MW, based on an MMD of	12:53 1	approach as his own, which we see in his final
2	125.68 [cubic] metres a second. But what he doesn't do,	2	conclusion in this section (PLA-2, section 5.9.5).
3	though, is explain how this figure factors into his	3	What this does effectively is that Professor Lafitte
4	theory of pondage calculation, you know: 131 MW,	4	ends up with a calculation methodology that is
5	125 cubic metres a second.	5	completely untethered from the Treaty, in Pakistan's
6	(Slide 57) But on the following page, the answer	6	submissions; and in particular, the requirement in
7	becomes clear when he describes India's submissions:	7	paragraph 8(c) that pondage be fixed in accordance with
8	"For its part, India, in its Counter-Memorial	8	what is required for firm power.
9	determined the Pondage based on a constant daily inflow	9	What he has ended up with is the pondage required
10	of 125.68 m3/s"	10	for peaking the Baglihar HEP above firm power,
11	That is, the MMD:	11	potentially all the way to that HEP's installed
12	" and with variations in turbine discharge	12	capacity. Put another way, he has calculated on the
13	corresponding to electricity consumption and especially	13	basis of pondage for secondary power, which, per
14	to the peak load hours. Respecting the mean value	14	paragraph 2(j), is the "power, other than Firm Power,
15	inflow during the week of 125 m3/s, the plant would only	15	available during certain periods of the year".
16	operate for 49.11 hours per week at its design discharge	16	(Slide 59) And more significantly again, by
17	and its installed capacity"	17	permitting India to generate for a specified number of
18	To put it another way, India's theory of pondage is	18	hours over a week, he has conflated power with energy.
19	as follows: they want to assume that the inflow of the	19	And you'll recall India's case, which is there on the
20	plant throughout the week is constantly at the MMD.	20	slide.
21	That's an unreasonable assumption that's not reflected	21	(Slide 60) We can see what happened when
22	in the real world. It wants to assume that India is	22	Professor Lafitte came to determine the maximum pondage
23	entitled to use that inflow to peak the Baglihar HEP not	23	for the Baglihar HEP. Again, the paragraphs of this
24	at the full firm power level; so it's not producing firm	24	part of the Baglihar determination are quite dense, and
25	power, but it wants to produce to its installed	25	we have the summary points for you on the slide.
	Page 125		Page 127
	-		-
		10 54 1	
1	capacity. Thus, he is assuming a pondage pool based on	12:54 1	So you assume all inflow into the HEP reservoir for
2	installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined	2	the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP
2 3	installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power".	2 3	the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with
2 3 4	installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to	2 3 4	the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD.
2 3 4 5	installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the	2 3 4 5	the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of
2 3 4 5 6	installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined"Firm Power".At this point, a load curve corresponding toelectricity consumption within India, together with therestrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how	2 3 4 5 6	the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, witha discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD.You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 ofAnnexure D, assuming there will always be increased
2 3 4 5 6 7	installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined"Firm Power".At this point, a load curve corresponding toelectricity consumption within India, together with therestrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine howmuch pondage is required using a series of mass curves.	2 3 4 5 6 7	the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, witha discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD.You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 ofAnnexure D, assuming there will always be increasedstorage during the week and increased discharge during
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c).
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of peak load hours is favourable to the increase of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will never be operating at firm power.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of peak load hours is favourable to the increase of the operating pool, which reaches 18.75 Mm3, and finally to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will never be operating at firm power. (Slide 61) But Professor Lafitte hadn't finished his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of peak load hours is favourable to the increase of the operating pool, which reaches 18.75 Mm3, and finally to the pondage which is double: 37.5 Mm3." 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will never be operating at firm power. (Slide 61) But Professor Lafitte hadn't finished his analysis there. He then had to tweak it slightly in
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of peak load hours is favourable to the increase of the operating pool, which reaches 18.75 Mm3, and finally to the pondage which is double: 37.5 Mm3." 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will never be operating at firm power. (Slide 61) But Professor Lafitte hadn't finished his analysis there. He then had to tweak it slightly in order to give India additional storage. The steps are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of peak load hours is favourable to the increase of the operating pool, which reaches 18.75 Mm3, and finally to the pondage which is double: 37.5 Mm3." So what Professor Lafitte has determined here is that India has tried to maximise its pondage by failing 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will never be operating at firm power. (Slide 61) But Professor Lafitte hadn't finished his analysis there. He then had to tweak it slightly in order to give India additional storage. The steps are set out on this slide here.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of peak load hours is favourable to the increase of the operating pool, which reaches 18.75 Mm3, and finally to the pondage which is double: 37.5 Mm3." So what Professor Lafitte has determined here is that India has tried to maximise its pondage by failing to set the storage and discharge schedule of the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will never be operating at firm power. (Slide 61) But Professor Lafitte hadn't finished his analysis there. He then had to tweak it slightly in order to give India additional storage. The steps are set out on this slide here. He notes that one of the objectives of pondage is to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of peak load hours is favourable to the increase of the operating pool, which reaches 18.75 Mm3, and finally to the pondage which is double: 37.5 Mm3." So what Professor Lafitte has determined here is that India has tried to maximise its pondage by failing to set the storage and discharge schedule of the Baglihar HEP in accordance with the load curve on which 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will never be operating at firm power. (Slide 61) But Professor Lafitte hadn't finished his analysis there. He then had to tweak it slightly in order to give India additional storage. The steps are set out on this slide here. He notes that one of the objectives of pondage is to enable operation during peak hours. Interesting, but
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of peak load hours is favourable to the increase of the operating pool, which reaches 18.75 Mm3, and finally to the pondage which is double: 37.5 Mm3." So what Professor Lafitte has determined here is that India has tried to maximise its pondage by failing to set the storage and discharge schedule of the Baglihar HEP in accordance with the load curve on which it's purporting to rely. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will never be operating at firm power. (Slide 61) But Professor Lafitte hadn't finished his analysis there. He then had to tweak it slightly in order to give India additional storage. The steps are set out on this slide here. He notes that one of the objectives of pondage is to enable operation during peak hours. Interesting, but not relevant under 8(c).
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 installed capacity, and not the Treaty-defined "Firm Power". At this point, a load curve corresponding to electricity consumption within India, together with the restrictions of paragraph 15, are used to determine how much pondage is required using a series of mass curves. It's a rather computationally dense process, certainly more dense than the one that Pakistan has set out. And then, although he doesn't say it here, the resulting pondage volume is then doubled per paragraph 8(c). As to this, the Neutral Expert observes: "As regards India's [calculation], the time of peak load hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday does not exactly correspond to the power demand of the Northern Region in winter It appears that this pattern of peak load hours is favourable to the increase of the operating pool, which reaches 18.75 Mm3, and finally to the pondage which is double: 37.5 Mm3." So what Professor Lafitte has determined here is that India has tried to maximise its pondage by failing to set the storage and discharge schedule of the Baglihar HEP in accordance with the load curve on which 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 the entire week is at the MMD. You assume that the HEP will operate continually through the week, with a discharge through the turbines above or below the MMD. You set a schedule in accordance with paragraph 15 of Annexure D, assuming there will always be increased storage during the week and increased discharge during the week. You use a series of mass curves to determine the total live storage required for such an operation to take place week by week. And then you double the live storage, so calculated, pursuant to paragraph 8(c). Nowhere in this analysis does Professor Lafitte tell us how this pondage is "required for Firm Power". Indeed, by his assumption that the discharge through the turbines will either be above or below the MMD, he seems to be suggesting that, on his model, the plant will never be operating at firm power. (Slide 61) But Professor Lafitte hadn't finished his analysis there. He then had to tweak it slightly in order to give India additional storage. The steps are set out on this slide here. He notes that one of the objectives of pondage is to enable operation during peak hours. Interesting, but

12:56	1	Pakistan's submission, betrays [a lack of] understanding	12:58 1	calculation, purportedly in order to meet the
	2	of the scheme of the Treaty and the relationship between	2	requirements of paragraph 15. This is, once more,
	3	Article III and Annexure D:	3	computationally dense, and results in a series of mass
	4	"Moreover, the NE cannot ignore the fact that one of	4	curves that appear at Annex 6.5.7.
	5	the object(s) and purpose(s) of the Preamble is for the	5	This then results in a pondage of 16.28 million
	6	two parties to attain '() the most complete and	6	cubic metres, which is then doubled to produce
	7	satisfactory utilisation of the waters of the Indus	7	an operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres.
	8	system of rivers ()'. In this context, the pondage	8	Now, that is, under Pakistan's understanding of the
	9	should be as large as possible, with the conditions,	9	Treaty, a colossal amount of pondage, equivalent to
	10	naturally, that the provisions of the Treaty are	10	72 hours of firm power or 21 hours' continuous
	11	respected. In particular, the rule mentioned in	11	production at the plant's installed capacity; values
	12	[paragraph 15 of Annexure D] is fundamental."	12	which lie far outside of industry norms for storage
	13	Now, pausing there. In Pakistan's submission,	13	volumes for power peaking. It is also far closer to
	14	that's a remarkable statement. Boiled down to its	14	India's requested pondage in that case of 37.5 million
	15	essentials, Professor Lafitte seems to be saying that	15	cubic metres than Pakistan's requested pondage of
	16	India is entitled to the greatest amount of live storage	16	6.22 million cubic metres.
	17	it can manage within the confines of the Treaty's	17	Again, it bears repeating that in the design that
	18	operational limitations. Put another way, despite the	18	Professor Lafitte considered, the Baglihar HEP had
	19	plain words of Article III, he is duty-bound to give	19	an installed capacity of 450 MW, and the 969 MW
	20	India the greatest amount of pondage the words of the	20	Neelum-Jhelum plant makes do with an operating pool of
	21	Treaty can bear.	21	3.8 million. Put another way, in terms of volume, you
	22	Now, the Court is aware of what the Treaty says, and	22	could fit 8.5 NJHEP operating pools into the Baglihar
	23	therefore why this is wrong. Article III gives	23	HEP operating pool. And the NJHEP has more than double
	24	Pakistan, as a headline and inalienable right, the	24	the installed capacity of the Baglihar HEP. So
	25	exclusive use of the waters of the Western Rivers. It	25	something is just not adding up.
		Page 129		Page 131
		-		-
12:57	1	does not give Pakistan the exclusive use of those waters	13:00 1	Another alarming figure that arises out of
12:57	1 2	does not give Pakistan the exclusive use of those waters only once India has extracted every drop of power it	13:00 1 2	Another alarming figure that arises out of Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar
12:57				
12:57	2	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally	2	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million
12:57	2 3	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as	2 3	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and
12:57	2 3 4	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally	2 3 4	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days,
12:57	2 3 4 5	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for	2 3 4 5	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from
12:57	2 3 4 5 6	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be	2 3 4 5 6	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream
12:57	2 3 4 5 6 7	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next]	2 3 4 5 6 7	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this time."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty intended. And yet, as India has told Pakistan again and
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this time." In short, he confesses that the pondage that this	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty intended. And yet, as India has told Pakistan again and again in the Commission, it is how it thinks the Treaty
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this time." In short, he confesses that the pondage that this result produces may well not be a useful amount of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty intended. And yet, as India has told Pakistan again and again in the Commission, it is how it thinks the Treaty works.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this time." In short, he confesses that the pondage that this result produces may well not be a useful amount of storage for very long, as the requirements of the power	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty intended. And yet, as India has told Pakistan again and again in the Commission, it is how it thinks the Treaty works. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this time." In short, he confesses that the pondage that this result produces may well not be a useful amount of storage for very long, as the requirements of the power system are going to be subject to change.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty intended. And yet, as India has told Pakistan again and again in the Commission, it is how it thinks the Treaty works. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, just a quick question.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this time." In short, he confesses that the pondage that this result produces may well not be a useful amount of storage for very long, as the requirements of the power system are going to be subject to change. Then fourth, having defined the number of peak	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty intended. And yet, as India has told Pakistan again and again in the Commission, it is how it thinks the Treaty works. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, just a quick question. You obviously emphasised the amount of volume and
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this time." In short, he confesses that the pondage that this result produces may well not be a useful amount of storage for very long, as the requirements of the power system are going to be subject to change.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty intended. And yet, as India has told Pakistan again and again in the Commission, it is how it thinks the Treaty works. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, just a quick question.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this time." In short, he confesses that the pondage that this result produces may well not be a useful amount of storage for very long, as the requirements of the power system are going to be subject to change. Then fourth, having defined the number of peak hours, he then introduces additional peak hours into the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty intended. And yet, as India has told Pakistan again and again in the Commission, it is how it thinks the Treaty works. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, just a quick question. You obviously emphasised the amount of volume and the length of time. But putting this into the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	only once India has extracted every drop of power it possibly can from them. To claim otherwise, as Professor Lafitte seems to do, is to fundamentally misunderstand and, by extension, misapply the Treaty. Now, returning to his calculations, he then effectively introduces the concept of peak hours for increased generation. He accepts that this should be based "on a forecast of power demand [for the next] 15 or 20 years in the Northern Region of India". However, that's not what India has given him. So he instead adopts a load curve for the same region in December 2004. So he fixes the pondage for a plant that could function for up to a century on the basis of a single month in a single year. And then he admits that: "We are aware of the uncertainties of this approach, but it is the best available to us at this time." In short, he confesses that the pondage that this result produces may well not be a useful amount of storage for very long, as the requirements of the power system are going to be subject to change. Then fourth, having defined the number of peak	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 Professor Lafitte's calculation: given that the Baglihar HEP site MMD is 125.68 cubic metres per second, and further given its operating pool of 32.56 million cubic metres a second, then if the Chenab is flowing at the MMD level, it will take 72 hours, or 3 full days, for India to fill the Baglihar HEP operating pool from the dead storage level, allowing for zero downstream releases; that is, assuming India doesn't comply with paragraph 15. So what this means is that through the Baglihar HEP, India can turn off the taps on the Chenab above Baglihar for 3 days in the dry season. This alone is bad enough. But if similar generosity is extended to India with respect to all its other HEPs on the Chenab, constructed and planned, then the situation becomes orders of magnitude more grim. Now, that cannot be what the drafters of the Treaty intended. And yet, as India has told Pakistan again and again in the Commission, it is how it thinks the Treaty works. THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, just a quick question. You obviously emphasised the amount of volume and

13:01	1	perspective of, again, [Annexure] E, where India has	13:03 1	Professor Buytaert, the load curve that they're using is
15.01	2	an allowance, if you call it like that, for storage	13.05 1	going to very quickly be rendered out of date: it's
	2	plants, which the calculation I think is around	3	therefore unfit for purpose. It's sensitive to errors
	4	2,000 million cubic metres, this amount would seem	4	or omissions in the input data, because obviously that
		relatively small compared to that allowance for storage		data is entirely provided by India. It's not rooted in
	5		5	
	6 7	plants.	6	data that India must provide under Appendix II of Annexure D. I think we've discussed with Mr Shah, who
		One could even take that further and do a thought	7	has confirmed that India does not provide a load curve.
	8	exercise: what if India would have said that Baglihar is	8	*
	9 10	a storage plant, falling, therefore, under the conditions of Annexure E? Would that have made the	9 10	And because India is the one who is setting the load
	10 11	design compliant with the criteria of a storage plant?	10	curve or, even if they weren't using a load curve, setting the paragraph 15 storage and discharge schedule
	11		11 12	on the basis of which this computation depends it's
	12	Annexure E, as you know I mean, the amount of storage	12	going to allow India to unilaterally manipulate the
	13 14	that India gets under Annexure E is banked in, right?	13 14	result.
	14	It's a fixed amount and it's geographically limited.	14	So in our submission, this fails to meet all of the
	15 16	When you're dealing with run-of-river HEPs under	15	six criteria that we have in mind.
	17	Annexure D, there's no limit on the number of these	10	(Slide 64) Finally, we've got part VI on answering
	18	plants that India can build. It's not just about one	17	the Court's question on pondage. I have to take this
	19	plant; it's about what happens when you just keep	18	very quickly. It's only one slide.
	20	building them and keep building them and keep building	19 20	(Slide 65) If you recall, we've got the question on
	20 21	them, and give them more and more and more storage over	20 21	the slide.
	21	the time. Eventually you end up with a situation in	21 22	(Slide 66) And then following that, we've got the
	22	which the live storage starts to get really quite	22	relevant and irrelevant factors for pondage calculation.
	23 24	considerable indeed, and starts eating into the	23 24	Now, the first one is obvious based on what
	24 25	exclusive right to the waters of the Western Rivers.	24 25	I've said, which is that in Pakistan's submission, the
	25	exclusive right to the waters of the western krivers.	25	i ve said, which is that if i akistali s subhission, the
		Page 133		Page 135
13:02	1	So that would be my initial approach to your	13:04 1	touchstone of paragraph 8(c) is the phrase "Pondage
13:02	1 2	So that would be my initial approach to your question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty	13:04 1 2	touchstone of paragraph 8(c) is the phrase "Pondage required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us,
13:02				
13:02	2	question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty	2	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us,
13:02	2 3	question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next	2 3	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level.
13:02	2 3 4	question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round.	2 3 4	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows
13:02	2 3 4 5	question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for	2 3 4 5	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D,
13:02	2 3 4 5 6	question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round.PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award:
13:02	2 3 4 5 6 7	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is
13:02	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers"
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. It is deliberately and expressly premised on giving 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount. Then finally, on the right, we have the irrelevant
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. It is deliberately and expressly premised on giving India the capacity to produce secondary power. It does 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount. Then finally, on the right, we have the irrelevant factors. I mean, to a certain extent, it's anything
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. It is deliberately and expressly premised on giving India the capacity to produce secondary power. It does not meet the sufficiency criteria; in fact, in 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount. Then finally, on the right, we have the irrelevant factors. I mean, to a certain extent, it's anything I haven't already mentioned. But it's paragraphs 2(c)
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. It is deliberately and expressly premised on giving India the capacity to produce secondary power. It does not meet the sufficiency criteria; in fact, in Pakistan's submission, it fails all of them. It doesn't 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount. Then finally, on the right, we have the irrelevant factors. I mean, to a certain extent, it's anything I haven't already mentioned. But it's paragraphs 2(c) and 15 of Annexure D; it's information not required to
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. It is deliberately and expressly premised on giving India the capacity to produce secondary power. It does not meet the sufficiency criteria; in fact, in Pakistan's submission, it fails all of them. It doesn't derive its pondage from the MMD. Its computation using 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount. Then finally, on the right, we have the irrelevant factors. I mean, to a certain extent, it's anything I haven't already mentioned. But it's paragraphs 2(c) and 15 of Annexure D; it's information not required to be provided India under Appendix II of Annexure D; it's
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. It is deliberately and expressly premised on giving India the capacity to produce secondary power. It does not meet the sufficiency criteria; in fact, in Pakistan's submission, it fails all of them. It doesn't derive its pondage from the MMD. Its computation using 1960s tools is not straightforward; or in any event, not 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount. Then finally, on the right, we have the irrelevant factors. I mean, to a certain extent, it's anything I haven't already mentioned. But it's paragraphs 2(c) and 15 of Annexure D; it's information not required to be provided India under Appendix II of Annexure D; it's any other extra-Treaty material; it's any calculation
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. It is deliberately and expressly premised on giving India the capacity to produce secondary power. It does not meet the sufficiency criteria; in fact, in Pakistan's submission, it fails all of them. It doesn't derive its pondage from the MMD. Its computation using 1960s tools is not straightforward; or in any event, not as straightforward as Pakistan's approach. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount. Then finally, on the right, we have the irrelevant factors. I mean, to a certain extent, it's anything I haven't already mentioned. But it's paragraphs 2(c) and 15 of Annexure D; it's information not required to be provided India under Appendix II of Annexure D; it's any other extra-Treaty material; it's any calculation techniques not available in 1960 or not able to be done
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. It is deliberately and expressly premised on giving India the capacity to produce secondary power. It does not meet the sufficiency criteria; in fact, in Pakistan's submission, it fails all of them. It doesn't derive its pondage from the MMD. Its computation using 1960s tools is not straightforward; or in any event, not 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount. Then finally, on the right, we have the irrelevant factors. I mean, to a certain extent, it's anything I haven't already mentioned. But it's paragraphs 2(c) and 15 of Annexure D; it's information not required to be provided India under Appendix II of Annexure D; it's any other extra-Treaty material; it's any calculation
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 question, but I think that there's going to be a pretty substantial presentation on Annexure E in the next round. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay. Perhaps we should keep it for then. Thank you. DR MILES: Mr Chair, if you give me five more minutes, I'll be done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's do that. DR MILES: (Slide 63) Alright. So very quickly, the summary of the approach detriments. We can see them on the slide. India's approach, in our submission, does not comply with the Treaty. It neglects and distorts paragraphs 8(c) and 2(i) of Annexure D, in preference to paragraph 2(c) and paragraph 15. It gives more pondage than required for firm power. It is deliberately and expressly premised on giving India the capacity to produce secondary power. It does not meet the sufficiency criteria; in fact, in Pakistan's submission, it fails all of them. It doesn't derive its pondage from the MMD. Its computation using 1960s tools is not straightforward; or in any event, not as straightforward as Pakistan's approach. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	required for Firm Power". As paragraph 2(i) tells us, "Firm Power" is the power an annexure D.3 HEP can produce instantaneously when the river in question flows at the MMD level. Now, I won't take you back to it, but this is again the raison d'être of the live storage under Annexure D, as found by the Kishenganga Court in its partial award: " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western Rivers" The second relevant consideration is the relationship between firm power and the MMD. Third criterion: the need, in order to provide firm power, to pass all flow received in 24 hours through the turbines at the MMD rate within the same 24 hours, and then we double the resulting amount. Then finally, on the right, we have the irrelevant factors. I mean, to a certain extent, it's anything I haven't already mentioned. But it's paragraphs 2(c) and 15 of Annexure D; it's information not required to be provided India under Appendix II of Annexure D; it's any other extra-Treaty material; it's any calculation techniques not available in 1960 or not able to be done

13:06 1	any other matters.	13:08 1	discharge schedule and all the rest of it, and we'll get
2	Members of the Court, you've been very patient with	2	there, but you're not going to be told what's behind the
3	me as I have taken you through some very technical but	3	storage and discharge schedule.
4	very important material. Rather than test your patience	4	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Well, I had a quick look at P-586,
5	further with some wrap-up comments, I will conclude	5	which I think Sir Daniel drew our attention to yesterday
6	here. Unless you have any further questions, those are	6	in his closing remarks, and I actually had a quick look
7	my submissions for this first round.	7	through it. And it seems to me that that's a letter
8	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.	8	from the Pakistan Commissioner in 1992, and according to
9	(1.06 pm)	9	that letter, it seems to suggest that at least in that
10	Questions from THE COURT	10	particular occasion of Baglihar, they provided the load
11	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I'm really sorry to eat into your lunch	11	curves. I think that the Pakistan Commissioner was not
12	break, but I would be very keen to go back could we	12	very happy about the load curves, but that's perhaps
13	bring up the slides again? I think if you go back to	13	a different thing. But at least there it would seem
14		14	
15	one (slide 63).	15	exchange.
16		16	-
17	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: So a quick comment on point 3.	17	practice.
18	From an engineering perspective, I think there's	18	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, it might not be. But at least
19	a difference between a load curve that might change over	19	thank you for confirming that.
20	25 years and what you said: a load curve that might very	20	I guess you agree that under point 5, at least
21	quickly become obsolete. It's not because things change	21	according to the Treaty, they would have to provide
22	over 25 years that they very quickly become incorrect.	22	those data as part of the calculation; is that right?
23	That's just an engineering comment.	23	DR MILES: No, I don't think I would necessarily concede
24	DR MILES: No, I think we actually agree on that point,	24	that. But, you know, it's not for me to do that. I can
25	Professor.	25	simply go away and I can check the position.
	Page 137		Page 139
13:07 1	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But more important, I think, is your	13:09 1	I suppose this also depends on what is the proper
13:07 1 2		13:09 1 2	I suppose this also depends on what is the proper methodology. Because depending on what you feel the
	point 5. So you say:		
2	point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide"	2	methodology. Because depending on what you feel the
2 3	point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because	2 3	methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the
2 3 4	point 5. So you say:"Is not rooted in data that India must provide"But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D,	2 3 4	methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve.
2 3 4 5	point 5. So you say:"Is not rooted in data that India must provide"But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D,	2 3 4 5	methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption
2 3 4 5 6	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". 	2 3 4 5 6	methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve.PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation,
2 3 4 5 6 7	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) 	2 3 4 5 6 7	methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve.PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve.PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. If India includes the load curves into that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements. So, Sir Daniel, I think we are certainly at our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. If India includes the load curves into that calculation, clearly the load curves are part of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements. So, Sir Daniel, I think we are certainly at our lunch break. I would propose that we come back at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. If India includes the load curves into that calculation, clearly the load curves are part of the calculations that, under this point, India would have to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements. So, Sir Daniel, I think we are certainly at our lunch break. I would propose that we come back at the normal time of 2 o'clock, since I understand you've got
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. If India includes the load curves into that calculation, clearly the load curves are part of the calculations that, under this point, India would have to provide to Pakistan as part of this appendix. DR MILES: Except that they don't provide us with a load 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements. So, Sir Daniel, I think we are certainly at our lunch break. I would propose that we come back at the normal time of 2 o'clock, since I understand you've got plenty to keep us busy during the afternoon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. If India includes the load curves into that calculation, clearly the load curves are part of the calculations that, under this point, India would have to provide to Pakistan as part of this appendix. DR MILES: Except that they don't provide us with a load curve. So they provide us with the and I'll go back 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements. So, Sir Daniel, I think we are certainly at our lunch break. I would propose that we come back at the normal time of 2 o'clock, since I understand you've got plenty to keep us busy during the afternoon. Is it your expectation that if we do that, we will, in all likelihood, finish up on time? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Yes, indeed. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. If India includes the load curves into that calculation, clearly the load curves are part of the calculations that, under this point, India would have to provide to Pakistan as part of this appendix. DR MILES: Except that they don't provide us with a load curve. So they provide us with the and I'll go back 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements. So, Sir Daniel, I think we are certainly at our lunch break. I would propose that we come back at the normal time of 2 o'clock, since I understand you've got plenty to keep us busy during the afternoon. Is it your expectation that if we do that, we will, in all likelihood, finish up on time?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. If India includes the load curves into that calculations that, under this point, India would have to provide to Pakistan as part of this appendix. DR MILES: Except that they don't provide us with a load curve. So they provide us with the and I'll go back and I'll check in due course, of course. But my 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements. So, Sir Daniel, I think we are certainly at our lunch break. I would propose that we come back at the normal time of 2 o'clock, since I understand you've got plenty to keep us busy during the afternoon. Is it your expectation that if we do that, we will, in all likelihood, finish up on time? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Yes, indeed. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. If India includes the load curves into that calculations that, under this point, India would have to provide to Pakistan as part of this appendix. DR MILES: Except that they don't provide us with a load curve. So they provide us with the and I'll go back and I'll check in due course, of course. But my understanding is that what will happen is you'll get 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements. So, Sir Daniel, I think we are certainly at our lunch break. I would propose that we come back at the normal time of 2 o'clock, since I understand you've got plenty to keep us busy during the afternoon. Is it your expectation that if we do that, we will, in all likelihood, finish up on time? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Yes, indeed. And I'm grateful for the allowance of eating a little bit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 point 5. So you say: "Is not rooted in data that India must provide" But then I think you softened your point. Because indeed, if I look at this Appendix II to Annexure D, I think it does say let me just pull it up, the point on the calculations of the "Particulars of Design". (Pause) At 3(b), it says: "Full Pondage Level, Dead Storage Level and Operating Pool together with the calculations for the Operating Pool." And you mentioned that's why I asked earlier the question about operating pool and pondage; you answered that those are the same. So that clearly includes also the calculations for pondage. If India includes the load curves into that calculations that, under this point, India would have to provide to Pakistan as part of this appendix. DR MILES: Except that they don't provide us with a load curve. So they provide us with the and I'll go back and I'll check in due course, of course. But my understanding is that what will happen is you'll get 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 methodology. Because depending on what you feel the proper methodology is, that's going to change what the calculations are for the computation of the load curve. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Absolutely. But under the assumption that the load curve would be part of the calculation, I would expect that it's provided as part of the calculations. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that exchange highlights why we are, in part, interested in as much material about the exchanges that have taken place over the decades relating to the plants, to see exactly what kind of information is flowing back and forth, which may or may not be driven by the Treaty requirements. So, Sir Daniel, I think we are certainly at our lunch break. I would propose that we come back at the normal time of 2 o'clock, since I understand you've got plenty to keep us busy during the afternoon. Is it your expectation that if we do that, we will, in all likelihood, finish up on time? SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Yes, indeed. And I'm grateful for the allowance of eating a little bit into the lunch break; no pun intended.

13:11	I interjected a moment ago, it was not in any shape or	14:18 1	45 minutes subject, of course, to the Court's
	2 form intended to dampen down on the questions, because	2	questions so we may be able to make up a little bit
	I must say that the Pakistan team is finding these	3	of extra time.
	questions actually very important because it's, in the	4	Response to the Court's pre-hearing questions 1(a) and (b)
	absence of the Respondent, the only way that we can	5	and 2(b)
	focus our argument. So we welcome the questions.	6	DR MILES: (Slide 1) Mr Chairman, members of the Court,
	7 We will, I think, on the current schedule, finish	0 7	we come now to the final leg of my submissions before
			you for this round. I am, as always, extremely grateful
	-	8	
	have any wriggle room.	9	for your patience and attention.
	0 This brings me to a question. Dr Miles is going to	10	(Slide 3) This presentation, as foreshadowed by
1	5	11	Sir Daniel, addresses three questions asked by the Court
1		12	in its direction of 20 June 2024: that's questions $1(a)$,
1		13	1(b) and 2(b). And as is tradition, I have them for you
1		14	on the slide.
1		15	As the Court makes clear in the chapeau to
1		16	question 1, these questions have evidently been
1		17	motivated by your desire to understand how Pakistan and
1		18	India's duelling interpretations of the technical
1		19	criteria of paragraph 8 of Annexure D would operate in
2		20	practice.
2	•	21	Question 1 deals with Pakistan's interpretation of
2		22	these criteria. To that end, question 1(a) asks how
2	5	23	Pakistan's interpretation of paragraph 8, if applied to
2		24	the Baglihar HEP, would have affected that HEP's design;
2	5 Sir Daniel!	25	and question 1(b) asks how that same interpretation of
	Page 141		Page 143
	e		
13:12	We certainly are going to continue to ask questions	1	paragraph 8 would have affected the design of our old
	We certainly are going to continue to ask questions during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of	1 2	
2			friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming
	during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of	2	
2	during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions.	2 3	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8.
	during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount ofresponse helps us in formulating our further questions.But you can expect that we will provide you with written	2 3 4	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's
	during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount ofresponse helps us in formulating our further questions.But you can expect that we will provide you with writtenquestions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was	2 3 4 5	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. 	2 3 4 5 6	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, 	2 3 4 5 6 7	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision.
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision.
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation.
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c).
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c).
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) (2.17 pm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level. Second, there is the question of the placement of
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) (2.17 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that fire alarm was perhaps 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level.
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) (2.17 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that fire alarm was perhaps a combination example of an operation of Murphy's law 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level. Second, there is the question of the placement of power intakes under paragraph 8(f). On Pakistan's interpretation, intakes located entirely below dead
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) (2.17 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that fire alarm was perhaps a combination example of an operation of Murphy's law and hydro, in that we were sent out into the rain a bit. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level. Second, there is the question of the placement of power intakes under paragraph 8(f). On Pakistan's interpretation, intakes located entirely below dead storage level are also considered outlets for the
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) 7 (2.17 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that fire alarm was perhaps a combination example of an operation of Murphy's law and hydro, in that we were sent out into the rain a bit. We did lose a little bit of time; we'll see how we do 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level. Second, there is the question of the placement of power intakes under paragraph 8(f). On Pakistan's interpretation, intakes located entirely below dead storage level are also considered outlets for the purposes of Annexure D, and so this also engages,
	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) (2.17 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that fire alarm was perhaps a combination example of an operation of Murphy's law and hydro, in that we were sent out into the rain a bit. We did lose a little bit of time; we'll see how we do over the afternoon of picking that back up. We can 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level. Second, there is the question of the placement of power intakes under paragraph 8(f). On Pakistan's interpretation, intakes located entirely below dead storage level are also considered outlets for the purposes of Annexure D, and so this also engages, potentially, paragraph 8(d).
2 2 3 3 4 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) (2.17 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that fire alarm was perhaps a combination example of an operation of Murphy's law and hydro, in that we were sent out into the rain a bit. We did lose a little bit of time; we'll see how we do over the afternoon of picking that back up. We can adjust accordingly. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level. Second, there is the question of the placement of power intakes under paragraph 8(f). On Pakistan's interpretation, intakes located entirely below dead storage level are also considered outlets for the purposes of Annexure D, and so this also engages, potentially, paragraph 8(d). Third, there is a question of spillway design and
2 2 3 3 4 3 4 4 3 4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) (2.17 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that fire alarm was perhaps a combination example of an operation of Murphy's law and hydro, in that we were sent out into the rain a bit. We did lose a little bit of time; we'll see how we do over the afternoon of picking that back up. We can adjust accordingly. So, Dr Miles, I think we're back to you. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level. Second, there is the question of the placement of power intakes under paragraph 8(f). On Pakistan's interpretation, intakes located entirely below dead storage level are also considered outlets for the purposes of Annexure D, and so this also engages, potentially, paragraph 8(e). Again, spillways
2 2 3 3 4 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) (2.17 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that fire alarm was perhaps a combination example of an operation of Murphy's law and hydro, in that we were sent out into the rain a bit. We did lose a little bit of time; we'll see how we do over the afternoon of picking that back up. We can adjust accordingly. So, Dr Miles, I think we're back to you. DR MILES: Thank you very much. I hope not to take the full 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level. Second, there is the question of the placement of power intakes under paragraph 8(f). On Pakistan's interpretation, intakes located entirely below dead storage level are also considered outlets for the purposes of Annexure D, and so this also engages, potentially, paragraph 8(d). Third, there is a question of spillway design and placement under paragraph 8(e). Again, spillways located entirely below the dead storage level are
2 2 3 3 4 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	 during the course of the day. Eliciting some amount of response helps us in formulating our further questions. But you can expect that we will provide you with written questions by no later than noon tomorrow, as was previously anticipated. So let's leave it at that. Thank you, Dr Miles, very much for your presentation this morning. It's been a long haul for you. But you're not quite done yet for the day, so DR MILES: It's okay, Mr Chair, I can do this all day! THE CHAIRMAN: We look forward you seeing you at 2 o'clock. (1.13 pm) (Adjourned until 2.00 pm) (2.00 pm) (Evacuation due to fire alarm) (2.17 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that fire alarm was perhaps a combination example of an operation of Murphy's law and hydro, in that we were sent out into the rain a bit. We did lose a little bit of time; we'll see how we do over the afternoon of picking that back up. We can adjust accordingly. So, Dr Miles, I think we're back to you. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	friend the Neelum-Jhelum hydroelectric plant, assuming in arguendo that the NJHEP were subject to paragraph 8. Now, question 2 of course deals with India's interpretation. And to that end, question 2(b) asks how India's interpretation of paragraph 8 would have affected the design of Neelum-Jhelum, assuming again that the NJHEP is subject to the criteria set out in that provision. (Slide 4) Now, as between these two approaches, there are four broad areas that need to be addressed, on my estimation. First, we have this morning's subject, which is the question of maximum pondage under paragraph 8(c). That's important, as it sets the size of the operating pool and therefore fixes our dead storage level. Second, there is the question of the placement of power intakes under paragraph 8(f). On Pakistan's interpretation, intakes located entirely below dead storage level are also considered outlets for the purposes of Annexure D, and so this also engages, potentially, paragraph 8(d). Third, there is a question of spillway design and placement under paragraph 8(e). Again, spillways

14:20	1 considered outlets, so this also will engage	14:23 1	they have to prove a need for it. And a gated spillway
	2 paragraph 8(d).	14.25 1	will be possible in some cases: usually a crest-gated
	3 And finally, we've got the question of freeboard	3	spillway, not an orifice gated spillway. But no matter
	4 under paragraph 8(a).	4	what the nature of the beast is, it cannot be used to
	5 (Slide 5) So to this end, with your permission,	5	deplete dead storage.
	• •		
	 I propose to proceed expeditiously as follows. First, I'm going to answer question 1 in two parts: 	6	Freeboard. Very quick. Free overflow feature at
		7	the full pondage level; minimum safe freeboard based on international standards.
	· ·	8	
		9 10	So that's Pakistan's position in a nutshell. Let's turn to look at how it would apply to modify the design
			of Neelum-Jhelum. I realise that this is question 1(b),
	1 that approach to the Baglihar HEP and Neelum-Jhelum,	11 12	2
	2 answering questions 1(a) and (b) in the process.		coming after question 1(a) sequentially. But given how
	3 Second, I will also answer question 2(b), also in	13	familiar the Court is with Neelum-Jhelum, it's perhaps
	4 two parts: first, I will provide a brief description of5 India's approach to paragraph 8; and second, I will	14 15	a better starting point than Baglihar.
	6 answer question 2(a) by applying that approach to the	15	(Slide 8) So a very familiar image, as you see on the slide. This is the Neelum-Jhelum plant as built,
			without the constraints of the Indus Waters Treaty.
	*	17	•
	8 (Slide 7) So turning now to question 1, and let's9 turn first to Pakistan's approach. You've been	18	So on the slide, we have here the full pondage level. This is at 1,015 metres above sea level. And
	addressed on this over the past day and a half. You are	19 20	
	× •		then there's the dead storage level: that's coming in at 1,008 metres above sea level. And between those two,
	familiar with the parameters of the argument, and therefore I'll just run through them in whistle-stop	21 22	
	fashion.	22 23	we've got our existing operating pool of 3.8 million cubic metres.
	4 So on pondage, very familiar to you by now.	23	Now, if we are going to apply Pakistan's
	 Pakistan derives the pondage from the hydrology and 	24	understanding of paragraph 8 to this design, we're going
2		25	
	Page 145		Page 147
14.21	1 emphasises the need for firm power production only in	14.24 1	to see some immediate areas of difficulty. I think
14:21		14:24 1	to see some immediate areas of difficulty. I think I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as
	2 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of	2	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as
	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer 		I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway.
	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, 	2 3	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as
	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer 	2 3 4	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool.
	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 	2 3 4 5	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum
	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. 	2 3 4 5 6	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on
	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you 	2 3 4 5 6 7	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway.First of all, we've got the operating pool.Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly
	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under
1	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And
1	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have
11111	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir.
1 1 1 1 1	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of
1 1 1 1 1	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going
1 1 1 1 1 1	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the intakes must be located at the highest level, consistent with satisfactory and economical construction and 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the original design.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the intakes must be located at the highest level, consistent with satisfactory and economical construction and operation of the HEP as a run-of-river HEP. And then when we're dealing with the deep intake, which is wholly below the dead storage level, we're 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the original design. Now, with the dead storage level higher in the reservoir, our intakes which are currently located here (indicating), more or less; that's the headrace
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the intakes must be located at the highest level, consistent with satisfactory and economical construction and operation of the HEP as a run-of-river HEP. And then when we're dealing with the deep intake, 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ \end{array} $	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the original design. Now, with the dead storage level higher in the reservoir, our intakes which are currently located
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the intakes must be located at the highest level, consistent with satisfactory and economical construction and operation of the HEP as a run-of-river HEP. And then when we're dealing with the deep intake, which is wholly below the dead storage level, we're going to be dealing with paragraph 8(d) there as well. If they are required and in Pakistan's estimation 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the original design. Now, with the dead storage level higher in the reservoir, our intakes which are currently located here (indicating), more or less; that's the headrace tunnel, moving out through the collecting canal they're going to have to rise as well. Their depth is
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the intakes must be located at the highest level, consistent with satisfactory and economical construction and operation of the HEP as a run-of-river HEP. And then when we're dealing with the deep intake, which is wholly below the dead storage level, we're going to be dealing with paragraph 8(d) there as well. If they are required and in Pakistan's estimation they are rarely required they must be as small and 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the original design. Now, with the dead storage level higher in the reservoir, our intakes which are currently located here (indicating), more or less; that's the headrace tunnel, moving out through the collecting canal they're going to have to rise as well. Their depth is presently fixed by the need to maintain a water seal
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the intakes must be located at the highest level, consistent with satisfactory and economical construction and operation of the HEP as a run-of-river HEP. And then when we're dealing with the deep intake, which is wholly below the dead storage level, we're going to be dealing with paragraph 8(d) there as well. If they are required and in Pakistan's estimation they are rarely required they must be as small and high as possible. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the original design. Now, with the dead storage level higher in the reservoir, our intakes which are currently located here (indicating), more or less; that's the headrace tunnel, moving out through the collecting canal they're going to have to rise as well. Their depth is presently fixed by the need to maintain a water seal when the operating pool is at the minimum level,
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the intakes must be located at the highest level, consistent with satisfactory and economical construction and operation of the HEP as a run-of-river HEP. And then when we're dealing with the deep intake, which is wholly below the dead storage level, we're going to be dealing with paragraph 8(d) there as well. If they are required and in Pakistan's estimation they are rarely required they must be as small and high as possible. Spillways and outlets: India is entitled ipso facto 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the original design. Now, with the dead storage level higher in the reservoir, our intakes which are currently located here (indicating), more or less; that's the headrace tunnel, moving out through the collecting canal they're going to have to rise as well. Their depth is presently fixed by the need to maintain a water seal when the operating pool is at the minimum level, minimising vortices that would pull floating trash into
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the intakes must be located at the highest level, consistent with satisfactory and economical construction and operation of the HEP as a run-of-river HEP. And then when we're dealing with the deep intake, which is wholly below the dead storage level, we're going to be dealing with paragraph 8(d) there as well. If they are required and in Pakistan's estimation they are rarely required they must be as small and high as possible. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the original design. Now, with the dead storage level higher in the reservoir, our intakes which are currently located here (indicating), more or less; that's the headrace tunnel, moving out through the collecting canal they're going to have to rise as well. Their depth is presently fixed by the need to maintain a water seal when the operating pool is at the minimum level,
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 accordance with paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And on Pakistan's estimation, the answer for every HEP, a unique and fixed value for every HEP, is going to be 50% of the minimum mean discharge, 12 hours of storage, multiplied by 2. On power intakes, Professor Webb has addressed you on these. So Pakistan considers that the principal reference point for determining the height of the intakes is the dead storage level. When dealing with a surface-level intake partly above the dead storage level, which is Pakistan's preferred design, paragraph 8(f) provides that the intakes must be located at the highest level, consistent with satisfactory and economical construction and operation of the HEP as a run-of-river HEP. And then when we're dealing with the deep intake, which is wholly below the dead storage level, we're going to be dealing with paragraph 8(d) there as well. If they are required and in Pakistan's estimation they are rarely required they must be as small and high as possible. Spillways and outlets: India is entitled ipso facto 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	I have the laser pointer here. It's not quite as responsive as one would like, but let's try it anyway. First of all, we've got the operating pool. Pakistan has calculated the MMD at the Neelum-Jhelum site as equalling 57.42 metres cubed per second. So on this basis, the NJHEP operating pool has a slightly bigger volume than would be permitted under paragraph 8(c), so it's going to have to shrink. And when it shrinks, the dead storage level is going to have to rise in the reservoir. I've marked the new dead storage level of 1,011 metres above sea level on the slide. That's going to reflect an operating pool of 2.48 million cubic metres, so about 1.3 million less than the original design. Now, with the dead storage level higher in the reservoir, our intakes which are currently located here (indicating), more or less; that's the headrace tunnel, moving out through the collecting canal they're going to have to rise as well. Their depth is presently fixed by the need to maintain a water seal when the operating pool is at the minimum level, minimising vortices that would pull floating trash into

1	a corresponding amount with the dead storage level,	14:28 1	discharge.
2	without breaching that water seal.	2	But if it transpires that, despite all of this,
3	As to the freeboard, the auxiliary spillway of the	3	Neelum-Jhelum is no longer sustainable from a sediment
4	NJHEP which, if you recall, is around here	4	management perspective, then paragraph 8 does not permit
5	(indicating) is a surface-gated spillway with the top	5	the introduction of an orifice spillway or any other
	of the gates at the full pondage level. So that		low-level outlet into the design to allow for flushing.
6		6	
7	provides the free overflow feature that prevents	7	On this point, the Kishenganga Court's
8	deliberate overfilling of the operating pool, pursuant	8	interpretation decision is extremely clear: in such
9	to paragraph 8(a). So we have	9	a case, the solution is not to construct the HEP so as
10	a paragraph 8(a)-compliant design.	10	to breach the prohibition on drawdown flushing; it's to
11	As to the height of the freeboard itself, at the	11	build the HEP at a more suitable site, or investigate
12	moment the NJHEP has a normal freeboard of 4 metres.	12	other sediment management techniques: for example,
13	3 metres of that is surcharge storage, and so the	13	dredging.
14	minimum freeboard is only 1 metre.	14	Now, when all that's said and done, what's the
15	Now, given that NJHEP includes an embankment element	15	Treaty-compliant design going to look like?
16	in addition to its concrete dam and you'll remember	16	(Slide 9) Now, we don't propose to give you a fully
17	the embankment element well over here this is likely	17	developed alternative design, presented in AutoCAD or
18	already in the minimum safe freeboard, and so	18	some other kind of software; we didn't really have the
19	paragraph 8(a) is not going to require us to lower it.	19	time to do that. But we do have a rough approximation
20	We now come to the really problematic part of the	20	that we've knocked up for you. And it is here on the
21	design, which is of course the deep orifice spillway.	21	slide.
22	Paragraphs 8(d) and (e), in Pakistan's appreciation,	22	You'll see the features that we've just discussed.
23	are extremely suspicious of this. From Pakistan's view,	23	We've got a smaller operating pool, resulting in
24	if this spillway were included in an Indian HEP, it	24	a higher dead storage level. The intakes have been
25	would have a blinking red light next to it. It's really	25	raised to reflect that higher dead storage level, and
	Page 149		Page 151
	1 age 149		1 age 131
14:27 1	low, it's right down the bottom, it's almost at the	1	they've been expressly made surface-level intakes.
14:27 1 2	low, it's right down the bottom, it's almost at the floor of the reservoir itself.	1 2	they've been expressly made surface-level intakes. We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full
	-		
2	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking	2	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full
2 3	floor of the reservoir itself.	2 3	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface
2 3 4	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage	2 3 4	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the
2 3 4 5	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush	2 3 4 5	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and
2 3 4 5 6 7	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's	2 3 4 5 6 7	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative
2 3 4 5 6	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt	2 3 4 5 6 7	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind of ungated spillway capacity.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from the HEP operator's perspective than this one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind of ungated spillway capacity. Now, this leads on to the question of sediment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from the HEP operator's perspective than this one. But one thing is very clear: the NJHEP, in its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind of ungated spillway capacity. Now, this leads on to the question of sediment management.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from the HEP operator's perspective than this one. But one thing is very clear: the NJHEP, in its current configuration, would not be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind of ungated spillway capacity. Now, this leads on to the question of sediment management. With its gated surface spillway, the Neelum-Jhelum	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from the HEP operator's perspective than this one. But one thing is very clear: the NJHEP, in its current configuration, would not be paragraph 8-compliant. Were it subject to Annexure D,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind of ungated spillway capacity. Now, this leads on to the question of sediment management. With its gated surface spillway, the Neelum-Jhelum operator should be able to undertake sluicing, keeping	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from the HEP operator's perspective than this one. But one thing is very clear: the NJHEP, in its current configuration, would not be paragraph 8-compliant. Were it subject to Annexure D, it would need to be redesigned.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind of ungated spillway capacity. Now, this leads on to the question of sediment management. With its gated surface spillway, the Neelum-Jhelum operator should be able to undertake sluicing, keeping the live storage free of sediment. The discharge	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from the HEP operator's perspective than this one. But one thing is very clear: the NJHEP, in its current configuration, would not be paragraph 8-compliant. Were it subject to Annexure D, it would need to be redesigned. So that's question 1(b) answered. Let's now have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind of ungated spillway capacity. Now, this leads on to the question of sediment management. With its gated surface spillway, the Neelum-Jhelum operator should be able to undertake sluicing, keeping the live storage free of sediment. The discharge capacity required for sluicing would be quite high: in	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from the HEP operator's perspective than this one. But one thing is very clear: the NJHEP, in its current configuration, would not be paragraph 8-compliant. Were it subject to Annexure D, it would need to be redesigned. So that's question 1(b) answered. Let's now have a look at the same approach to the Baglihar HEP to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind of ungated spillway capacity. Now, this leads on to the question of sediment management. With its gated surface spillway, the Neelum-Jhelum operator should be able to undertake sluicing, keeping the live storage free of sediment. The discharge capacity required for sluicing would be quite high: in the order of a 1-in-50-year return period of flood	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from the HEP operator's perspective than this one. But one thing is very clear: the NJHEP, in its current configuration, would not be paragraph 8-compliant. Were it subject to Annexure D, it would need to be redesigned. So that's question 1(b) answered. Let's now have
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	floor of the reservoir itself. More to the point and as you know from speaking to Mr Miana and his team this thing is built to flush the Neelum-Jhelum reservoir deep below dead storage level. It's intended to empty it entirely. And it's been used for this function twice in the plant's lifetime. The Kishenganga commandment applies here: thou shalt not deplete dead storage. The only reason that the Neelum-Jhelum HEP would be permitted such a spillway is if it were necessary to pass the design flow to a PMF. Now, in Pakistan's view, this is not necessary, and so up it must go. It must be replaced with either an ungated surface spillway or more likely, given that the site is quite narrow a gated surface spillway, maybe combined with some kind of ungated spillway capacity. Now, this leads on to the question of sediment management. With its gated surface spillway, the Neelum-Jhelum operator should be able to undertake sluicing, keeping the live storage free of sediment. The discharge capacity required for sluicing would be quite high: in	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 We've got our unchanged freeboard relative to the full pondage level. And the biggest change: a gated surface spillway, with the bottom level of the gates below the dead storage level, to pass the design flood and PMF and allow for sluicing. Now, I hasten to add: this is just one alternative design for the NJHEP that is paragraph 8-compliant, but nevertheless results in an efficient and functioning HEP. But it's not the only alternative; there are likely others. And as has been stressed by Pakistan throughout this hearing, engineers are ingenious people who are skilled in adapting to regulatory limits on design like those imposed by Treaty. I'm sure that with time and application of effort, there are many other designs that could be developed, some of which may be better from the HEP operator's perspective than this one. But one thing is very clear: the NJHEP, in its current configuration, would not be paragraph 8-compliant. Were it subject to Annexure D, it would need to be redesigned. So that's question 1(b) answered. Let's now have a look at the same approach to the Baglihar HEP to

14:30 1	(Slide 11) Here is Baglihar, on the slide. We	14:33 1	This stretch of the Chenab has an MMD of 125.68 cubic
2	needed to deposit the document that we did this morning	2	metres per second, and so on Pakistan's approach to
3	into the record because it contains an upstream	3	pondage, that leads to an operating pool of 5.43 million
4	elevation of the dam as built. So this is India telling	4	cubic metres. On this basis, we're going to be raising
5	us: Baglihar has been constructed, and here is what it	5	the dead storage level that's the green line to
6	looks like.	6	839.3 metres above sea level, which is just below the
7	Once more, we have the current dead storage level.	7	full pondage level. Again, an inch deep is quite a lot
8	I've marked that at sorry, that's the full pondage	8	when you multiply it out over a mile.
9	level, which is at 840 MASL, metres above sea level.	9	So second, the intakes. At the moment, as you can
10	And here's our dead storage level. You remember that	10	see from the slide, India has a relatively deep intake
11	we've got an enormous reservoir for Baglihar: it's	11	in its design, and that's going to need to be raised to
12	a mile wide and an inch deep. And so that gigantic	12	match the new dead storage level while maintaining the
13	operating pool is basically housed within that	13	existing water seal to minimise vortexing. And we'd
14	relatively small amount of vertical space. You'll	14	also like to turn that into a surface-level intake, with
15	recall that the dam is 144.5 metres tall.	15	a sill upstream from the deep part of the intake to
16	Now, we see that there are, from Pakistan's point of	16	minimise the amount of sediment that could enter; the
17	view, several problematic features with this design,	17	"skimming wall" that Professor Webb and Dr Morris talked
18	which was wrongly blessed, says Pakistan, by	18	about.
19	Professor Lafitte.	19	Now, third, freeboard. As I've described, Pakistan
20	Again, the pondage level allowed is far too high,	20	is of the view that Professor Lafitte was unduly
21	and therefore the dead storage level has been placed	21	conservative in his analysis of freeboard height. This
22	relatively deep in the reservoir to develop that volume.	22	could be reduced to 1.1 metres, the minimum height for
23	The intakes sorry. Well, they're fixed	23	concrete dams under the Bureau of Reclamation's
24	relatively deep down. There they are. The intakes are	24	memorandum on Freeboard Criteria.
25	fixed at 821 metres above sea level: that's a full	25	Then lastly, of course, but by no means least, we
	Page 153		Page 155
14.32 1	15 metres below India's already-too-low dead storage	14.35 1	have another deep orifice spillway with a blinking red
14:32 1 2	15 metres below India's already-too-low dead storage level. That's still an improvement on India's original	14:35 1 2	have another deep orifice spillway with a blinking red light next to it.
2	level. That's still an improvement on India's original	14:35 1 2 3	have another deep orifice spillway with a blinking red light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award
	• •	2	light next to it.
2 3	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for	2 3	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award
2 3 4	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again.	2 3 4	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is
2 3 4 5	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting	2 3 4 5	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway
2 3 4 5 6	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be	2 3 4 5 6	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must
2 3 4 5 6 7	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large	2 3 4 5 6 7	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command over considerable amounts of the reservoir volume. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated runners will be sufficient for sediment management
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command over considerable amounts of the reservoir volume. You'll recall that this was fixed at this level in 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated runners will be sufficient for sediment management purposes, such that those additional outlets are not
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command over considerable amounts of the reservoir volume. You'll recall that this was fixed at this level in the reservoir to allow it to be completed to a level 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated runners will be sufficient for sediment management purposes, such that those additional outlets are not necessary, and therefore prohibited.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command over considerable amounts of the reservoir volume. You'll recall that this was fixed at this level in the reservoir to allow it to be completed to a level 17 metres below dead storage level by flushing. And 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated runners will be sufficient for sediment management purposes, such that those additional outlets are not necessary, and therefore prohibited. So what's this going to look like? It's going to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command over considerable amounts of the reservoir volume. You'll recall that this was fixed at this level in the reservoir to allow it to be completed to a level 17 metres below dead storage level by flushing. And you'll further recall that exactly this operation was	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated runners will be sufficient for sediment management purposes, such that those additional outlets are not necessary, and therefore prohibited. So what's this going to look like? It's going to look like this. Again, Dr Morris has worked up
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command over considerable amounts of the reservoir volume. You'll recall that this was fixed at this level in the reservoir to allow it to be completed to a level 17 metres below dead storage level by flushing. And you'll further recall that exactly this operation was ruled impermissible in the Kishenganga partial award.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated runners will be sufficient for sediment management purposes, such that those additional outlets are not necessary, and therefore prohibited. So what's this going to look like? It's going to look like this. Again, Dr Morris has worked up an approximation, which we have for you on the slide.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command over considerable amounts of the reservoir volume. You'll recall that this was fixed at this level in the reservoir to allow it to be completed to a level 17 metres below dead storage level by flushing. And you'll further recall that exactly this operation was ruled impermissible in the Kishenganga partial award. So we're going to need to make some changes.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated runners will be sufficient for sediment management purposes, such that those additional outlets are not necessary, and therefore prohibited. So what's this going to look like? It's going to look like this. Again, Dr Morris has worked up an approximation, which we have for you on the slide. There may be other designs that are Treaty-compliant;
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command over considerable amounts of the reservoir volume. You'll recall that this was fixed at this level in the reservoir to allow it to be completed to a level 17 metres below dead storage level by flushing. And you'll further recall that exactly this operation was ruled impermissible in the Kishenganga partial award.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated runners will be sufficient for sediment management purposes, such that those additional outlets are not necessary, and therefore prohibited. So what's this going to look like? It's going to look like this. Again, Dr Morris has worked up an approximation, which we have for you on the slide.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	level. That's still an improvement on India's original design, rejected by Professor Lafitte, which called for intakes at 818 metres above sea level, so deeper again. The freeboard is broadly acceptable but, adopting Pakistan's position in Baglihar, it could afford to be lower. The dam is a concrete gravity dam with a large reservoir. It looks fairly safe to us and is not going to be susceptible to overtopping. And then, of course, we have the problematic orifice spillway, with gates sitting 35 metres below the dead storage level; that's at 801 metres above sea level. That's not as bad, from a paragraph 8 perspective, as the NJHEP's spillway. If it was at the very, very bottom of the reservoir, it would be extremely problematic. But this still, given the elevation that it's sitting at, gives the operator of the HEP command over considerable amounts of the reservoir volume. You'll recall that this was fixed at this level in the reservoir to allow it to be completed to a level 17 metres below dead storage level by flushing. And you'll further recall that exactly this operation was ruled impermissible in the Kishenganga partial award. So we're going to need to make some changes.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	light next to it. As with the NJHEP, the Kishenganga partial award makes it clear that flushing of the reservoir is prohibited. And given that the purpose of the spillway is to enable just this kind of flushing, the design must be changed to a crest-gated spillway, with the gate sill below the dead storage level to allow for sediment management via sluicing. And that will be sufficient to pass the design flood and the PMF. We could also examine the question of whether some undersluices may be needed to be added to the design below the intakes to better control sediment. But if those are added, they're going to be paragraph 8(d) outlets and they're going to have to be as small and high as possible within the reservoir. But it may be that raising the intakes combined with the use of coated runners will be sufficient for sediment management purposes, such that those additional outlets are not necessary, and therefore prohibited. So what's this going to look like? It's going to look like this. Again, Dr Morris has worked up an approximation, which we have for you on the slide. There may be other designs that are Treaty-compliant;

14:36 1	is a workable and efficient HEP.	14:38 1	And in view of the discussions we had over the last few
2	It has a smaller operating pool, resulting in	2	days, I wonder whether this site is a site that requires
3	a higher dead storage level. Now, again, as I said,	3	deep orifice spillways; or if not, and it's rather just
4	it doesn't look like much; but given the sheer size of	4	desirable, what might have been the specific reasons
5	the reservoir, this thing is roughly half as big again	5	that the engineers decided to go for this design?
6	as the NJHEP's existing operating pool.	6	I know you're (inaudible), so it's perhaps more
7	The intakes have been raised to reflect that higher	7	a question to Dr Morris. But I thought I'd flag it as
8	dead storage level and to reduce sediment ingress. The	8	something that would be really useful, I think, to have
9	freeboard height has been reduced relative to the	9	a feel of what kind of sacrifices India would make, in
10	unchanged full pondage level. And of course, our	10	
11	biggest change: a gated surface spillway with the bottom	11	spillways.
12	level of the gates below the dead storage level to allow	12	DR MILES: I will hold over a little bit for Dr Morris if
13	for sluicing, as well passage of the design flood and	13	required. But the immediate reaction is: as we heard
14	PMF.	14	-
15	Seasonal operation would require that the operating	15	they could flush the reservoir. And obviously, per
16	pool is held to the dead storage level every year to	16	Kishenganga, per the clear provisions of Annexure D,
17	allow for seasonal sluicing to take place. As Dr Morris	17	that right was forgone by India when it entered into the
18	said, that's best practice in any event.	18	Treaty on the terms it did.
19	Now, this design may create problems for India.	19	
20	As Dr Morris has pointed out, its choice to situate	20	would be allowed to have an orifice spillway that deep
21	the dam in such a way that we have a small operating	21	is if it was absolutely necessary to pass the design
22	pool on top of a large amount of dead storage is going	22	flood or the PMF. And the analysis that we've done
23	to create problems from a sediment management	23	indicates that you can get the same result with
24	perspective. Sediment sluicing will be required with	24	
25	the reservoir at the dead storage level, and the purpose	25	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.
	Page 157		Page 159
	č		č
		1	
14:37 1	of that procedure will be to limit the accumulation of	14:40 1	DR MILES: (Slide 13) So, as with question 1, on to
2	sediment in the pondage.	2	question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's
2 3	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of	2 3	question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach.
2 3 4	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the	2 3 4	question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives
2 3 4 5	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find	2 3 4 5	question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach.On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on
2 3 4 5 6	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by	2 3 4 5 6	question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach.On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived
2 3 4 5 6 7	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging.	2 3 4 5 6 7	question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach.On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach.On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sediment in the pondage.To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging.And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach.On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sediment in the pondage.To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging.And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project. So that concludes Pakistan's answer on question 1.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched. Insofar as spillways and outlets are concerned, India's predilection for drawdown flushing means that it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched. Insofar as spillways and outlets are concerned, India's predilection for drawdown flushing means that it prefers a deep orifice spillway, which it's going to use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project. So that concludes Pakistan's answer on question 1. (Slide 12) Question 2, concerning redesign of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched. Insofar as spillways and outlets are concerned, India's predilection for drawdown flushing means that it prefers a deep orifice spillway, which it's going to use for flood control and sediment management.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project. So that concludes Pakistan's answer on question 1. (Slide 12) Question 2, concerning redesign of the NJHEP in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched. Insofar as spillways and outlets are concerned, India's predilection for drawdown flushing means that it prefers a deep orifice spillway, which it's going to use for flood control and sediment management.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project. So that concludes Pakistan's answer on question 1. (Slide 12) Question 2, concerning redesign of the NJHEP in THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. DR MILES: Yes, Professor Buytaert. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched. Insofar as spillways and outlets are concerned, India's predilection for drawdown flushing means that it prefers a deep orifice spillway, which it's going to use for flood control and sediment management. As for freeboard, India's view appears to be that paragraph 8(a) doesn't regulate the freeboard. So as
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project. So that concludes Pakistan's answer on question 1. (Slide 12) Question 2, concerning redesign of the NJHEP in THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched. Insofar as spillways and outlets are concerned, India's predilection for drawdown flushing means that it prefers a deep orifice spillway, which it's going to use for flood control and sediment management. As for freeboard, India's view appears to be that paragraph 8(a) doesn't regulate the freeboard. So as long as they've got their free overflow feature at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project. So that concludes Pakistan's answer on question 1. (Slide 12) Question 2, concerning redesign of the NJHEP in THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. DR MILES: Yes, Professor Buytaert. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched. Insofar as spillways and outlets are concerned, India's predilection for drawdown flushing means that it prefers a deep orifice spillway, which it's going to use for flood control and sediment management. As for freeboard, India's view appears to be that paragraph 8(a) doesn't regulate the freeboard. So as long as they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level, they're fine. They then use the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project. So that concludes Pakistan's answer on question 1. (Slide 12) Question 2, concerning redesign of the NJHEP in THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. DR MILES: Yes, Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, coming back on the Neelum-Jhelum plant. (Pause) 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched. Insofar as spillways and outlets are concerned, India's predilection for drawdown flushing means that it prefers a deep orifice spillway, which it's going to use for flood control and sediment management. As for freeboard, India's view appears to be that paragraph 8(a) doesn't regulate the freeboard. So as long as they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level, they're fine. They then use the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 sediment in the pondage. To the extent that there may be some accumulation of sediment during extreme floods, when surcharge above the dead storage level might occur, India will need to find another way around the sediment problem: for example, by dredging. And again, if it concludes that the only way to manage sediment is through depleting dead storage through flushing, then the site is ex facie unsuitable for a HEP of this type. It will need to change its design that's to say India will possibly to a small dam with a tunnel; or it's going to need, if it's wedded to this kind of tall dam, short tunnel design, it's going to have to find somewhere else to build the project. So that concludes Pakistan's answer on question 1. (Slide 12) Question 2, concerning redesign of the NJHEP in THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Dr Miles, coming back on the Neelum-Jhelum plant. (Pause) So the Neelum-Jhelum plant, you mentioned that that 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 question 2. We'll start with a summary of India's approach. On pondage, very familiar by now. India derives pondage from load, a load that it chooses to place on the plant, and it then says that the pondage derived from that load is limited by the parameters of paragraph 15 of Annexure D. And then once it has figured out the pondage that it needs to meet the load, it then doubles the amount of pondage required. Now, in terms of power intakes, India prefers a deep intake, below the dead storage level, and says it's required to prevent vortices from forming. Of course, this is going to create some sediment management problems if it's not carefully watched. Insofar as spillways and outlets are concerned, India's predilection for drawdown flushing means that it prefers a deep orifice spillway, which it's going to use for flood control and sediment management. As for freeboard, India's view appears to be that paragraph 8(a) doesn't regulate the freeboard. So as long as they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level, they're fine. They then use the Indian standards to fix the safe freeboard, and they

14:41 1	dam to influence the height of the freeboard.	14:44 1	a 217.5 million cubic metre reservoir a little under
2	(Slide 14) So here is Neelum-Jhelum back on the	2	22 times the size of the current reservoir at the
3	slide, with the dead storage level and the full pondage	3	NJHEP site would be difficult, to say the least. And so
4	level obviously the other way round marked at	4	we've adopted the live storage/dead storage split from
5	1,008 and 1,015 metres above sea level respectively.	5	the KHEP, which is a more modest 41:59.
6	And we've got our 3.8 million cubic metre operating	6	So when we pull all this together, we're going to
7	pool.	7	have a dam with a crest at 1,069.4 metres above sea
8	So the first thing we're going to have to do is	8	level, a full pondage level at 1,064.4 metres above sea
9	apply India's pondage approach to the operating pool.	9	level and a dead storage level at 1,047.5 metres above
10	Now, just impressionistically, this is going to result	10	sea level. Now, the current crest of the dam is at
11	in an increased amount of pondage.	11	1,019 metres above sea level. So to fit in India's new
12	The difficulty that we have is that we don't know	12	operating pool, we're going to have to raise the dam by
13	the load that India is going to put on this plant,	13	about 40 metres, just about doubling its height. But
14	because it's not an Indian plant and therefore they've	14	India will be able to get its 21.75 million cubic metres
15	not provided us with a prospective paragraph 15	15	of pondage.
16	schedule. And so far, therefore, we can't calculate the	16	Now, of course a dam of this size is going to run
17	maximum pondage.	17	into some complications, especially at Neelum-Jhelum.
18	So from a certain point of view, the Court has asked	18	You will recall that we've got the main boundary thrust
19	a slightly impossible question. But we do want to be	19	running right down the axis between the embankment dam
20	helpful, and so what we've done is we've taken the	20	and the concrete dam, and a geological survey could
21	storage and discharge schedule that was approved by	21	reveal that an enlarged Neelum-Jhelum HEP just couldn't
22	Professor Lafitte in Baglihar and applied it to the	22	be built at the present site, and therefore you're going
23	minimum mean discharge for the Neelum-Jhelum HEP, which	23	to have to move the project.
24	is 57.42 cubic metres [per second]. And this is going	24	So on to intakes. They're still here. India
25	to result in an operating pool of 21.75 million	25	prefers a deep intake, as we know. But given how high
	D 1/1		D 1/2
	Page 161		Page 163
14:42 1	cubic metres, which is roughly what we would expect from	14:46 1	our dam now is, these will need to come up somewhat to
14:42 1	cubic metres, which is roughly what we would expect from India's methodology for a 969 MW plant.	14:46 1 2	our dam now is, these will need to come up somewhat to give the intake protection against sediment. But they
			-
2	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant.	2	give the intake protection against sediment. But they
2 3	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of	2 3	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead
2 3 4	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage	2 3 4	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference.
2 3 4 5	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres.	2 3 4 5	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be
2 3 4 5 6	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of	2 3 4 5 6	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set,
2 3 4 5 6 7	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million	2 3 4 5 6 7	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a).
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; or we can go up, increasing the full pondage level by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all fairness, acknowledges that flushing and passage of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; or we can go up, increasing the full pondage level by increasing the height of the dam. And so that's what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all fairness, acknowledges that flushing and passage of the design flood do not require it in terms to always be at
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; or we can go up, increasing the full pondage level by increasing the height of the dam. And so that's what we've done: we've increased the height of the dam wall 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all fairness, acknowledges that flushing and passage of the design flood do not require it in terms to always be at the bottom of the dead storage reservoir, and so they're
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; or we can go up, increasing the full pondage level by increasing the height of the dam. And so that's what we've done: we've increased the height of the dam wall to take account of the enlarged operating pool. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all fairness, acknowledges that flushing and passage of the design flood do not require it in terms to always be at the bottom of the dead storage reservoir, and so they're going to allow it to be raised. But it's still going to
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array} $	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; or we can go up, increasing the full pondage level by increasing the height of the dam. And so that's what we've done: we've increased the height of the dam wall to take account of the enlarged operating pool. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all fairness, acknowledges that flushing and passage of the design flood do not require it in terms to always be at the bottom of the dead storage reservoir, and so they're going to allow it to be raised. But it's still going to be well below the dead storage level.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; or we can go up, increasing the full pondage level by increasing the height of the dam. And so that's what we've done: we've increased the height of the dam wall to take account of the enlarged operating pool. But of course the operating pool is only live storage. We've also got to take account of dead 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all fairness, acknowledges that flushing and passage of the design flood do not require it in terms to always be at the bottom of the dead storage reservoir, and so they're going to allow it to be raised. But it's still going to be well below the dead storage level. And as you know, the NJHEP already has a crest-gated
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; or we can go up, increasing the full pondage level by increasing the height of the dam. And so that's what we've done: we've increased the height of the dam wall to take account of the enlarged operating pool. But of course the operating pool is only live storage. We've also got to take account of dead storage. The live storage/dead storage split in the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all fairness, acknowledges that flushing and passage of the design flood do not require it in terms to always be at the bottom of the dead storage reservoir, and so they're going to allow it to be raised. But it's still going to be well below the dead storage level. And as you know, the NJHEP already has a crest-gated auxiliary spillway, so that will remain right where it
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; or we can go up, increasing the full pondage level by increasing the height of the dam. And so that's what we've done: we've increased the height of the dam wall to take account of the enlarged operating pool. But of course the operating pool is only live storage. We've also got to take account of dead 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all fairness, acknowledges that flushing and passage of the design flood do not require it in terms to always be at the bottom of the dead storage reservoir, and so they're going to allow it to be raised. But it's still going to be well below the dead storage level. And as you know, the NJHEP already has a crest-gated
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	India's methodology for a 969 MW plant. Just by way of a yardstick, Baglihar, at the time of its construction, was only 450 MW, but it had a pondage pool of 32.56 million cubic metres. Just one problem though: the total impoundment of the entire NJHEP reservoir is only 10 million cubic metres. Put another way, and rounding up, India's approach has produced an operating pool 2.2 times the size of the NJHEP reservoir. So how are we going to deal with this? One option is going to be to move the project. The topography does not permit a reservoir this size with a dam the size of the NJHEP. But as Mr Farooq reminded us on the site visit, there are two ways to increase the size of an operating pool: we can go down, decreasing the dead storage level; or we can go up, increasing the full pondage level by increasing the height of the dam. And so that's what we've done: we've increased the height of the dam wall to take account of the enlarged operating pool. But of course the operating pool is only live storage. We've also got to take account of dead storage. The live storage/dead storage split in the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	give the intake protection against sediment. But they will still be rest assured well below the new dead storage level, which is India's preference. Freeboard. Well, India does not consider this to be regulated under the Treaty, so it's India's to set, provided they've got their free overflow feature at the full pondage level. So that stays where it is. And finally, of course, the spillway. Now, India, as I have said, favours a deep orifice spillway to allow it to flush the reservoir whilst, in the same structure, managing the design flood. And it's going to combine that with a surface-level spillway, gated or ungated, at the full pondage level, to prevent the operating pool from being overfilled, contrary to paragraph 8(a). Now, the NJHEP has an orifice spillway already, right at the bottom of the reservoir. But India, in all fairness, acknowledges that flushing and passage of the design flood do not require it in terms to always be at the bottom of the dead storage reservoir, and so they're going to allow it to be raised. But it's still going to be well below the dead storage level. And as you know, the NJHEP already has a crest-gated auxiliary spillway, so that will remain right where it

14:47 1	(Slide 15) So what's this going to look like?	14:50 1	a design, they say, "Well, no, this is what the load
2		2	requirements are, this is the load we're going to put on
3		3	the plant, and this is therefore the pondage that we're
2		4	entitled to". So when they're not obviously required to
5		5	under the Treaty, that's certainly the case. Certainly
e		6	whenever they put it forward, we get given the formula.
7		7	I suppose in some plants I think Salal is a good
8		8	example. So despite the fact that they're obviously
ç		9	entitled to pondage at Salal, they've put in no
10		10	operating pool at Salal, despite the fact they're
1		11	entitled to do so under the Treaty.
12		12	So it could well be that they won't always do this.
13		13	But certainly the recent practice Baglihar,
14		14	Kishenganga, Ratle is that Pakistan gets given the
1:	C C	15	formula, and that's the operating pool.
10		16	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.
17		17	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: At the same time, there are many other
18	-	18	dams built since the Treaty was put in place that seem
19		19	to have a much lower storage or pondage, some even
20	-	20	without any pondage, isn't it?
2		21	DR MILES: That's true, sir. There's a number of small
22		22	plants. I think the biggest one that they've built
23		23	without pondage has been Salal, which is 690 MW.
24		24	And certainly you're quite right. I mean, if you
25		25	look at I think it's Annexure C, not every plant they're
		-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Page 165		Page 167
14:48 1	going to be an increase in India's capacity to turn the	14:51 1	building is with live storage. But when we've had
14:48 1 2		14:51 1 2	building is with live storage. But when we've had a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that
	waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary		
2	waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent	2	a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that
2 3	waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same.	2 3	a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the
2 3 4	waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think	2 3 4	a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have
2 3 4 5	waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same.So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any	2 3 4	a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described.
2 3 4 5 6	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. 	2 3 4 5 6	a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much
2 3 4 5 6 7	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; and perhaps further confirm that they aren't compelled to do that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause) (2.53 pm) Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; and perhaps further confirm that they aren't compelled to do that. But I suppose what I'm mostly interested in is:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause) (2.53 pm) Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; and perhaps further confirm that they aren't compelled to do that. But I suppose what I'm mostly interested in is: is there a reason for us to think that India will 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause) (2.53 pm) Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility of a Narrative Dispositif PROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; and perhaps further confirm that they aren't compelled to do that. But I suppose what I'm mostly interested in is: is there a reason for us to think that India will invariably build to the maximum pondage level that they 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause) (2.53 pm) Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility of a Narrative Dispositif PROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Allow me to say, first of all, that I am pleased
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; and perhaps further confirm that they aren't compelled to do that. But I suppose what I'm mostly interested in is: is there a reason for us to think that India will invariably build to the maximum pondage level that they 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause) (2.53 pm) Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility of a Narrative Dispositif PROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Allow me to say, first of all, that I am pleased
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; and perhaps further confirm that they aren't compelled to do that. But I suppose what I'm mostly interested in is: is there a reason for us to think that India will invariably build to the maximum pondage level that they believe they're entitled to under the Treaty? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause) (2.53 pm) Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility of a Narrative Dispositif PROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Allow me to say, first of all, that I am pleased and honoured to be appearing before you, and to do so on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; and perhaps further confirm that they aren't compelled to do that. But I suppose what I'm mostly interested in is: is there a reason for us to think that India will invariably build to the maximum pondage level that they believe they're entitled to under the Treaty? DR MILES: First of all, you're quite right: paragraph 8(c) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause) (2.53 pm) Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility of a Narrative Dispositif PROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Allow me to say, first of all, that I am pleased and honoured to be appearing before you, and to do so on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Before elaborating upon the request in Pakistan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; and perhaps further confirm that they aren't compelled to do that. But I suppose what I'm mostly interested in is: is there a reason for us to think that India will invariably build to the maximum pondage level that they believe they're entitled to under the Treaty? DR MILES: First of all, you're quite right: paragraph 8(c) says "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool". So if 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause) (2.53 pm) Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility of a Narrative Dispositif PROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Allow me to say, first of all, that I am pleased and honoured to be appearing before you, and to do so on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Before elaborating upon the request in Pakistan's Memorial for a "narrative dispositif" approach, I will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 waters of the Western Rivers against Pakistan, contrary to the logic of the Treaty itself and Pakistan's intent in entering into the same. So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I think we're just about caught up. Unless you have any lingering questions, that ends my submissions. (2.49 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Dr Miles. The maximum pondage level isn't compelled by the Treaty in your designs for how India would do something like Neelum-Jhelum. I take it you're assuming that they will build to the level of the maximum pondage to which they would be entitled. First, you could confirm that; and perhaps further confirm that they aren't compelled to do that. But I suppose what I'm mostly interested in is: is there a reason for us to think that India will invariably build to the maximum pondage level that they believe they're entitled to under the Treaty? DR MILES: First of all, you're quite right: paragraph 8(c) says "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool". So if India desired, it could do a reduced pondage level. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 a plant perhaps a better way for me to put it is that whenever there's been a plant with a dispute over the live storage, it's been of the kind that I have described. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Presumably if the pondage is much lower, it's less likely to lead to a dispute? DR MILES: Well, quite. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I think I just need to thank you, Dr Miles, for your presentation. And if I understand correctly, it's now Professor Tanzi's opportunity, who has been waiting even more patiently than Dr Miles. So, Professor Tanzi, you're welcome to approach the podium, and when you're ready, please proceed. (Pause) (2.53 pm) Submissions on the Permissibility and Utility of a Narrative Dispositif PROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Allow me to say, first of all, that I am pleased and honoured to be appearing before you, and to do so on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Before elaborating upon the request in Pakistan's Memorial for a "narrative dispositif" approach, I will

14:53 1	Mr Fietta on Wednesday. In the interest of time,	14:56 1	legal analysis may also be found in relation to legal
14.55 1	response in appropriate detail will be developed in our	2	reasoning precisely in relation to treaty
3	second round of submissions.	3	interpretation. And this was the case in the 2012
4	First, concerning what constitutes an award for	4	Judgment on Land and Maritime Boundary case between
5	purposes of determining the scope of the res judicata	5	Cameroon and Nigeria.
6	effect applicable to it Day 3, page 143 the	6	Mr Chairman, we will submit the details, as
0 7	international adjudicative practice from Polish	0 7	I anticipated, before the end of these oral proceeding.
8	Postal Service to Bosnian Genocide, Arbitral Award of	8	But on a more general level, let me say that Pakistan
8 9	3 October 1899 (Guyana v Venezuela) adopts a wide	8 9	regards this formula one of incorporation by
9 10	margin for the determination of which parts of the	9 10	reference, if you wish as a modulation of the
10	reasoning are to be considered as "entailed in the	10	approach that Pakistan is asking you to take.
11	decision", following very much a case-specific approach.	11	In the next 30 minutes, I will be addressing
12	And as Mr Fietta explained with reference to the ICJ	12	an aspect of the request for declaratory relief which
13 14	holding in the latest Nicaragua v Colombia case,	13 14	
14 15	PLA-0108, it can be necessary in any event to determine	14	touches upon its form, but is closely related to its
15 16	the meaning of a res judicata dispositif by reference to	15	substance. I will address the former, and Sir Daniel, in his closing, will address the latter.
			-
17	the reasoning set out in the judgment in question.	17	Reduced to a single statement, Pakistan is asking
18	In our context, this would provide ground for	18	the Court to include an operative part in its award that
19 20	Pakistan's argument attaching res judicata effects to	19 20	is as expanded and as detailed as possible. The reasons
20	the specific passages quoted by Mr Fietta from the	20	for this request in relation to the present proceeding
21	motifs in the Kishenganga awards in the light of	21	may be quickly summarised.
22	paragraph 23 of Annexure G. However, the flexibility	22	The disputes before you emerge from the backdrop of
23	and little predictability which emerge from the	23	a broader controversy over similar issues which has been
24	international adjudicative practice on the point at	24	running for a long time; as recalled by Sir Daniel on
25	issue is precisely one of the many factors for	25	Monday, since "the earliest days following
	Page 169		Page 171
1	Pakistan's request from your Court of a narrative	14:57 1	independence". Despite repeated recourse to third-party
1 2	Pakistan's request from your Court of a narrative dispositif.	14:57 1 2	independence". Despite repeated recourse to third-party dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested
2	dispositif.	2	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested
2 3	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts	2 3	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and
2 3 4	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall	2 3 4	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so.
2 3 4 5	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court	2 3 4 5	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows
2 3 4 5 6	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this	2 3 4 5 6	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the
2 3 4 5 6 7	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to	2 3 4 5 6 7	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation judgment, the 2001 judgment on Maritime and Territorial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law. Even so, and even where the import of a particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation judgment, the 2001 judgment on Maritime and Territorial Delimitation between Qatar and Bahrain, PLA-0098, or the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law. Even so, and even where the import of a particular decision is clear and this takes me to the second
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation judgment, the 2001 judgment on Maritime and Territorial Delimitation between Qatar and Bahrain, PLA-0098, or the two Land and Maritime Delimitation judgments between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law. Even so, and even where the import of a particular decision is clear and this takes me to the second reason for the anticipated concern it cannot be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation judgment, the 2001 judgment on Maritime and Territorial Delimitation between Qatar and Bahrain, PLA-0098, or the two Land and Maritime Delimitation judgments between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. In such cases, the dispositif usually refers to delimitation or demarcation lines. Similarly, resort in dispositifs to referencing	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law. Even so, and even where the import of a particular decision is clear and this takes me to the second reason for the anticipated concern it cannot be excluded that doubts may be raised as to what the decision covers and what it does not. This has been the case in the Kishenganga partial award, which, as we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation judgment, the 2001 judgment on Maritime and Territorial Delimitation between Qatar and Bahrain, PLA-0098, or the two Land and Maritime Delimitation judgments between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. In such cases, the dispositif usually refers to delimitation or demarcation lines. Similarly, resort in dispositifs to referencing statements, determinations and findings reached in the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law. Even so, and even where the import of a particular decision is clear and this takes me to the second reason for the anticipated concern it cannot be excluded that doubts may be raised as to what the decision covers and what it does not. This has been the case in the Kishenganga partial award, which, as we know, was subject to a request for clarification and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation judgment, the 2001 judgment on Maritime and Territorial Delimitation between Qatar and Bahrain, PLA-0098, or the two Land and Maritime Delimitation judgments between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. In such cases, the dispositif usually refers to delimitation or demarcation lines. Similarly, resort in dispositifs to referencing statements, determinations and findings reached in the preceding legal analysis can be found in the Temple of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law. Even so, and even where the import of a particular decision is clear and this takes me to the second reason for the anticipated concern it cannot be excluded that doubts may be raised as to what the decision covers and what it does not. This has been the case in the Kishenganga partial award, which, as we know, was subject to a request for clarification and interpretation by India.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation judgment, the 2001 judgment on Maritime and Territorial Delimitation between Qatar and Bahrain, PLA-0098, or the two Land and Maritime Delimitation judgments between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. In such cases, the dispositif usually refers to delimitation or demarcation lines. Similarly, resort in dispositifs to referencing statements, determinations and findings reached in the preceding legal analysis can be found in the Temple of Preah Vihear 2013 judgment.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law. Even so, and even where the import of a particular decision is clear and this takes me to the second reason for the anticipated concern it cannot be excluded that doubts may be raised as to what the decision covers and what it does not. This has been the case in the Kishenganga partial award, which, as we know, was subject to a request for clarification and interpretation by India. This is no denying that the disputing parties are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation judgment, the 2001 judgment on Maritime and Territorial Delimitation between Qatar and Bahrain, PLA-0098, or the two Land and Maritime Delimitation judgments between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. In such cases, the dispositif usually refers to delimitation or demarcation lines. Similarly, resort in dispositifs to referencing statements, determinations and findings reached in the preceding legal analysis can be found in the Temple of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law. Even so, and even where the import of a particular decision is clear and this takes me to the second reason for the anticipated concern it cannot be excluded that doubts may be raised as to what the decision covers and what it does not. This has been the case in the Kishenganga partial award, which, as we know, was subject to a request for clarification and interpretation by India.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	dispositif. As to cases of dispositifs cross-referencing parts of the motifs, there are examples, indeed. We shall submit, Mr Chairman, detailed references to your Court in the second round. But allow me to stress that this adjudicative practice stretches from references to coordinates and demarcation lines to interpretative reasoning. Indeed, resort to this technique can be found in large supply in relation to territorial and maritime spaces to be delimited, be it for delimitation of boundaries or maritime zones for purposes of the determination of the sovereign rights. Suffice to recall the Jan Mayen Delimitation judgment, the 2001 judgment on Maritime and Territorial Delimitation between Qatar and Bahrain, PLA-0098, or the two Land and Maritime Delimitation judgments between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. In such cases, the dispositif usually refers to delimitation or demarcation lines. Similarly, resort in dispositifs to referencing statements, determinations and findings reached in the preceding legal analysis can be found in the Temple of Preah Vihear 2013 judgment.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	dispute settlement mechanisms by the parties, contested issues continue to arise as a source of dispute, and they may continue to do so. First, the history of the broader controversy shows the possibility for different mechanisms under the Treaty to reach solutions which may be, or may be interpreted as, mutually conflicting. The disagreements surrounding the determination by the Neutral Expert on the Baglihar project bear testament to the difficulties which may stem from such actual or potential contradictions. And this may occur despite, as shown by Mr Fietta, that it should be clear which outcome of different dispute settlement mechanisms should prevail in case of contradictory findings on matters of law. Even so, and even where the import of a particular decision is clear and this takes me to the second reason for the anticipated concern it cannot be excluded that doubts may be raised as to what the decision covers and what it does not. This has been the case in the Kishenganga partial award, which, as we know, was subject to a request for clarification and interpretation by India. This is no denying that the disputing parties are

14:59 1	interpret the award. However, the Treaty's	15:02 1	maximum possible clarity the legal obligations stemming
2	preoccupation with the finality of awards is clearly	2	from the award concerning the systematic interpretation
3	reflected in the extraordinary nature of that procedure,	3	of the Treaty. As indicated in the Memorial, Pakistan
4	which is subject to strict time limits, and which	4	considers that this would be essential for the purposes
5	determines, after its completion, the dissolution of the	5	of providing full certainty as to what constitutes the
6	Court.	6	unquestionably binding part of the Court's award.
7	And yet, such procedure may lend itself to abuse.	7	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, within the time
8	India's request for interpretation of the Kishenganga	8	that remains and I will try to be fast my
9	partial award was in fact not so much an invitation to	9	submission will come in five parts.
10	the Court to spell out a complex legal point, but	10	First, I will contextualise the request for
11	a clear attempt to narrow the scope of the decision.	11	a narrative dispositif within the framework of
12	And as explained by Mr Fietta, even if the Kishenganga	12	a declaratory award and its rationale.
13	Court firmly rejected this attempt, controversy as to	13	Second, I will express Pakistan's concerns in
14	the true meaning of that award continued, and does	14	relation to the vulnerability of an unqualified
15	continue to this day.	15	declaratory relief, which I have anticipated a while
16	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan	16	ago.
17	commenced these proceedings after much hesitation.	17	Third, I will illustrate how Pakistan's request does
18	Eventually, as Mr Aslam said before you during the first	18	not, and is not intended to, trespass the boundaries of
19	set of hearings (Hearing on Competence, Day 3, page 84,	19	judicial propriety.
20	lines 13-25), this decision was made:	20	Fourth, I will demonstrate that the Court is fully
21	" in the hope that [an] equitable and fair	21	entitled to follow a narrative dispositif approach, and
22	decision would restore balance to the Treaty and	22	that doing so would be appropriate and useful, if not
23	allow it to remain, as it has for over 60 years,	23	required, for purposes of the proper administration of
24	a reliable cornerstone for peaceful relations between	24	justice.
25	India and Pakistan."	25	Finally, I will close with a few concluding remarks.
	Page 173		Page 175
			1 ago 175
15:00 1	The history of the relations between the two parties	15:03 1	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, in its written
15:00 1 2	The history of the relations between the two parties provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the	15:03 1 2	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, in its written submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination
2	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the	2	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination
2 3	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows	2 3	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal
2 3 4	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the	2 3 4	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative
2 3 4 5	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully	2 3 4 5	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of
2 3 4 5 6	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award,	2 3 4 5 6	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief.
2 3 4 5 6 7	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully	2 3 4 5 6 7	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their vulnerability or its vulnerability to frivolous	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including financial compensation, as may [be] claimed."
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their vulnerability or its vulnerability to frivolous objections and vexatious claims in the future,	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including financial compensation, as may [be] claimed." That the Treaty should expressly mention financial
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their vulnerability or its vulnerability to frivolous objections and vexatious claims in the future, particularly when the defendant has regrettably chosen	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including financial compensation, as may [be] claimed." That the Treaty should expressly mention financial compensation within a wider range of potential forms of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their vulnerability or its vulnerability to frivolous objections and vexatious claims in the future, particularly when the defendant has regrettably chosen not to appear.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including financial compensation, as may [be] claimed." That the Treaty should expressly mention financial compensation within a wider range of potential forms of relief corroborates the view that no constraints apply
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their vulnerability or its vulnerability to frivolous objections and vexatious claims in the future, particularly when the defendant has regrettably chosen not to appear. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it is with this	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including financial compensation, as may [be] claimed." That the Treaty should expressly mention financial compensation within a wider range of potential forms of relief corroborates the view that no constraints apply to the remedial competence of the Court, let alone to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their vulnerability or its vulnerability to frivolous objections and vexatious claims in the future, particularly when the defendant has regrettably chosen not to appear. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it is with this in mind that Pakistan asks you to deliver as detailed 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including financial compensation, as may [be] claimed." That the Treaty should expressly mention financial compensation within a wider range of potential forms of relief corroborates the view that no constraints apply to the remedial competence of the Court, let alone to the extent requiring the Court to depart from the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their vulnerability or its vulnerability to frivolous objections and vexatious claims in the future, particularly when the defendant has regrettably chosen not to appear. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it is with this	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including financial compensation, as may [be] claimed." That the Treaty should expressly mention financial compensation within a wider range of potential forms of relief corroborates the view that no constraints apply to the remedial competence of the Court, let alone to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their vulnerability or its vulnerability to frivolous objections and vexatious claims in the future, particularly when the defendant has regrettably chosen not to appear. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it is with this in mind that Pakistan asks you to deliver as detailed a dispositif as possible, so as to clarify with the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including financial compensation, as may [be] claimed." That the Treaty should expressly mention financial compensation within a wider range of potential forms of relief corroborates the view that no constraints apply to the remedial competence of the Court, let alone to the extent requiring the Court to depart from the adjudicative principle ne infra petita.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 provides ample evidence of the need for a ruling of the kind requested by Pakistan. At the same time, it shows how difficult it is for one such ruling to withstand the test of the constant challenges by the other party. These challenges may well pay lip-service to the award, only to suggest that they do so because it has not fully disposed of the questions submitted to the Court. As it has already been discussed, disagreements on questions of res judicata typically bear on its material scope in each specific case. And as acknowledge by Mr Fietta, it may hinge on the relationship between dispositif and motifs. This is a point to which we will likely return next week in relation to your question (a), Mr Chairman. It is therefore understandable that Pakistan would be concerned that the finality of your award or awards be protected, Mr Chairman, so as to minimise their vulnerability or its vulnerability to frivolous objections and vexatious claims in the future, particularly when the defendant has regrettably chosen not to appear. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it is with this in mind that Pakistan asks you to deliver as detailed 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	submissions, Pakistan asked you to deliver a combination of injunctive and declaratory relief. I shall deal exclusively with the latter, for the narrative dispositif Pakistan is requesting is but a form of declaratory relief. The availability of declaratory relief as a form of reparation in international adjudication is beyond dispute. Whilst the Treaty does not provide specific rules concerning its availability, it provides no exceptions to the general rule either, just as well as under Article 36 of the ICJ Statute. Paragraph 2(b) of Annexure G of the Treaty requires that the Request for Arbitration include a statement setting forth, inter alia, "the nature of the relief sought". Moreover, paragraph 23 provides that: "The Court shall render its Award, in writing, on the issues in dispute and on such relief, including financial compensation, as may [be] claimed." That the Treaty should expressly mention financial compensation within a wider range of potential forms of relief corroborates the view that no constraints apply to the remedial competence of the Court, let alone to the extent requiring the Court to depart from the

15.05 1		15.00 1	
15:05 1	The widespread use of declaratory relief responds to	15:08 1	legally binding scope of the decision.
2	two intertwined exigencies for purposes of the settlement of a dispute on a case-specific basis. The	2	Already mentioned practice before the International Court of Justice points to the difficulties that may
3		3	
4	first one concerns the special nature of most	4	arise when one party is either genuinely perplexed about
5	international disputes, where restitution or	5	the scope of the obligations stemming from the decision,
6	compensation may not be fully conducive to the	6	or about its actual meaning, or is rather determined to
7	resolution of the controversy.	7	narrow down, ex post, its material scope.
8	The second one pertains to the need for flexibility,	8	The third concern, Mr Chairman, pertains to the fact
9	including as a matter of form, where a comprehensive and	9	that, as already mentioned, the interpretation procedure
10	serviceable blueprint is required for the resolution of	10	remains an extraordinary remedy, subject to strict time
11	the dispute to have a full and lasting effect. As put	11	limits, and destined to extinguish the Court with its
12	in straightforward terms by Judge Leonardo Nemer	12	use.
13	Caldeira Brant in his recent entry on "Finality of	13	In light of such concerns, a narrative dispositif in
14	Judgments":	14	your award could accomplish several vital objectives
15	" a declaratory judgment [or award] puts	15	that would materially enhance an effective and durable
16	a definitive end to the controversy and is equally	16	solution of the present disputes.
17	binding on the parties [as a constitutive one]."	17	First and foremost, it would provide much needed
18	This was well illustrated by the Permanent Court of	18	clarity on the central legal issues of the disputes
19	International Justice in the interpretation proceedings	19	before you and the conclusions that you will reach. By
20	in the Chorzów Factory case. The court referred to	20	setting forth the key determinations in the operative
21	Judgment No. 7 as one being:	21	part of the award, rather than leaving them to be pieced
22	" in the nature of a declaratory judgment, the	22	together from the statement of reasons, the space for
23	intention of which is to ensure recognition of	23	divergent interpretations by the parties further down
24	a situation at law, once and for all and with binding	24	the line would be significantly reduced.
25	force as between the Parties; so that the legal position	25	And by delineating the parties' respective rights
	Page 177		Page 179
15:07 1	thus established cannot again be called in question in	15:09 1	and obligations in an articulated and readily accessible
2	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are	2	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt,
2 3	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned."	2 3	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal
2 3 4	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that:	2 3 4	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the
2 3	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator]	2 3 4 5	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward.
2 3 4 5 6	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty	2 3 4 5 6	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is
2 3 4 5 6 7	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing	2 3 4 5 6 7	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and dispositif. And if the balance is skewed in favour of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is functional to the resolution of a live dispute, this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and dispositif. And if the balance is skewed in favour of the motifs, controversy may arise as to why something	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is functional to the resolution of a live dispute, this does not turn a decision in a contentious case into
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and dispositif. And if the balance is skewed in favour of the motifs, controversy may arise as to why something has not been included in the dispositif.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is functional to the resolution of a live dispute, this does not turn a decision in a contentious case into an advisory opinion. As the International Court of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and dispositif. And if the balance is skewed in favour of the motifs, controversy may arise as to why something has not been included in the dispositif.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is functional to the resolution of a live dispute, this does not turn a decision in a contentious case into an advisory opinion. As the International Court of Justice put it in Fisheries Jurisdiction:
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and dispositif. And if the balance is skewed in favour of the motifs, controversy may arise as to why something has not been included in the dispositif. Second, there may be matters that the award disposes of, either cursorily or even implicitly, which under the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is functional to the resolution of a live dispute, this does not turn a decision in a contentious case into an advisory opinion. As the International Court of Justice put it in Fisheries Jurisdiction: " there is no incompatibility with its judicial
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and dispositif. And if the balance is skewed in favour of the motifs, controversy may arise as to why something has not been included in the dispositif. Second, there may be matters that the award disposes of, either cursorily or even implicitly, which under the good faith principle would entirely reasonably provide	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is functional to the resolution of a live dispute, this does not turn a decision in a contentious case into an advisory opinion. As the International Court of Justice put it in Fisheries Jurisdiction: " there is no incompatibility with its judicial function in making a pronouncement on the rights and
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and dispositif. And if the balance is skewed in favour of the motifs, controversy may arise as to why something has not been included in the dispositif. Second, there may be matters that the award disposes of, either cursorily or even implicitly, which under the good faith principle would entirely reasonably provide strong ground for legal guidance to the parties. But	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is functional to the resolution of a live dispute, this does not turn a decision in a contentious case into an advisory opinion. As the International Court of Justice put it in Fisheries Jurisdiction: " there is no incompatibility with its judicial function in making a pronouncement on the rights and duties of the Parties under existing international law
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and dispositif. And if the balance is skewed in favour of the motifs, controversy may arise as to why something has not been included in the dispositif. Second, there may be matters that the award disposes of, either cursorily or even implicitly, which under the good faith principle would entirely reasonably provide	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is functional to the resolution of a live dispute, this does not turn a decision in a contentious case into an advisory opinion. As the International Court of Justice put it in Fisheries Jurisdiction: " there is no incompatibility with its judicial function in making a pronouncement on the rights and
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned." In Northern Cameroons, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment [an adjudicator] expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability" Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this being said, a declaratory award, like any other adjudicative decision, is not free from vulnerabilities, particularly if, after it has been handed down, the parties go on to disagree. I will confine myself to three specific concerns. The first one pertains to the question, already discussed, of the material scope of the decision, with special regard to the balance between motifs and dispositif. And if the balance is skewed in favour of the motifs, controversy may arise as to why something has not been included in the dispositif. Second, there may be matters that the award disposes of, either cursorily or even implicitly, which under the good faith principle would entirely reasonably provide strong ground for legal guidance to the parties. But	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	form, whose legally binding force would be beyond doubt, your Court would engender a more secure and stable legal framework for the relations between them under the Treaty going forward. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is asking nothing of this Court which would be in any way inconsistent with judicial propriety. First, Pakistan is not asking for an advisory opinion, which the Treaty does not make provision for. On the contrary, the present phase of the proceedings in which we are engaged are the subject of express direction by the Court. And the absence of the Respondent cannot turn an adversarial proceeding into a hypothetical one. It is accepted that a decision of a declaratory nature may have a broad scope. And so long as it is functional to the resolution of a live dispute, this does not turn a decision in a contentious case into an advisory opinion. As the International Court of Justice put it in Fisheries Jurisdiction: " there is no incompatibility with its judicial function in making a pronouncement on the rights and duties of the Parties under existing international law

15:11 1	reach."	15:14 1	declaratory award or awards does not render Pakistan's
13.11 1	Second, Pakistan is not asking this Court to preempt	2	request inapposite.
3	any future claims by India concerning Pakistan's	3	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, having outlined
3 4	responsibility under the Treaty in other potential	4	the features of a narrative dispositif and the reasons
	disputes based on different sets of facts and claims,		
5	-	5	for requesting it, I will now address, first, the power
6	thus abusingly stretching the res judicata principle.	6	of the Court to render such dispositif; and second, the
7	The ICJ was recently faced with the point at issue	7	appropriateness, usefulness and need for it to exercise
8	in the jurisdictional phase of the Genocide case between	8	such power in the present proceedings.
9	Ukraine and Russia. And while the circumstances of the	9	As to the first point, under the combined provisions
10	case are radically different, the court's view of the	10	of paragraph 23 of Annexure G and Article 26(6) of the
11	matter is material to the present proceedings.	11	Court's Supplemental Rules of Procedure on the "forms
12	In essence, Russia argued that a declaratory	12	requirements" of an award of the Court, no constraints
13	judgment, as requested by the applicant, recognising	13	emerge as to the Court's power to render such
14	Ukraine's compliance with its own obligations, would not	14	a dispositif.
15	fall within the bounds of judicial propriety. Russia	15	And no constraints of the sort may be inferred from
16	grounded its claim, inter alia, on the assumption that	16	the general adjudicative practice. Once the
17	the requested declaratory judgment could preempt claims	17	jurisdictional mandate over a given dispute is assessed,
18	against Ukraine under new evidence based on the	18	the remedial competence of the adjudicator must follow,
19	operation of the res judicata attaching to the judgment.	19	which is constrained only in substance by the general
20	The ICJ was not persuaded. In rejecting the	20	principles ne ultra and ne infra petita and the canons
21	respondent's arguments, it acknowledged that whenever	21	of judicial propriety, as the case may be.
22	a dispute is settled by way of a judgment, there is	22	As observed by Ian Brownlie in addressing
23	always a possibility that a future claim may be covered	23	declaratory judgments in general:
24	by res judicata. But this possibility alone, said the	24	"There are no problems of forms and the category
25	court, does not provide a basis for finding that	25	of declaratory judgments is very diverse in contents".
	Page 181		Page 183
	. 0		
15:12 1	a request for declaratory relief is inconsistent with	15:16 1	As to the second point, namely of the
15:12 1 2	judicial propriety.	15:16 1 2	appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to
	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did,		appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative
2	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its	2	appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others,
2 3	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of	2 3	appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance.
2 3 4	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of	2 3 4	appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's
2 3 4 5 6 7	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this	2 3 4 5	appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the
2 3 4 5 6	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses	2 3 4 5 6	appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's
2 3 4 5 6 7	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's request is aimed at obtaining:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law. In fact, in Northern Cameroons, the court declined
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's request is aimed at obtaining: " recognition of a situation at law, once and for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law. In fact, in Northern Cameroons, the court declined to exercise its jurisdiction because the treaty at issue
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's request is aimed at obtaining: " recognition of a situation at law, once and for all and with binding force as between the Parties; so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law. In fact, in Northern Cameroons, the court declined to exercise its jurisdiction because the treaty at issue had been terminated. Differently in the present case,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's request is aimed at obtaining: " recognition of a situation at law, once and for all and with binding force as between the Parties; so that the legal position thus established cannot again be	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law. In fact, in Northern Cameroons, the court declined to exercise its jurisdiction because the treaty at issue had been terminated. Differently in the present case, the Treaty whose interpretation is in dispute is
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's request is aimed at obtaining: " recognition of a situation at law, once and for all and with binding force as between the Parties; so that the legal position thus established cannot again be called into question in so far as the legal effects	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law. In fact, in Northern Cameroons, the court declined to exercise its jurisdiction because the treaty at issue had been terminated. Differently in the present case, the Treaty whose interpretation is in dispute is perfectly in force, and this mechanism is aimed at
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's request is aimed at obtaining: " recognition of a situation at law, once and for all and with binding force as between the Parties; so that the legal position thus established cannot again be called into question in so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned."	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law. In fact, in Northern Cameroons, the court declined to exercise its jurisdiction because the treaty at issue had been terminated. Differently in the present case, the Treaty whose interpretation is in dispute is perfectly in force, and this mechanism is aimed at enhancing its validity and integrity. And the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's request is aimed at obtaining: " recognition of a situation at law, once and for all and with binding force as between the Parties; so that the legal position thus established cannot again be called into question in so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned."	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law. In fact, in Northern Cameroons, the court declined to exercise its jurisdiction because the treaty at issue had been terminated. Differently in the present case, the Treaty whose interpretation is in dispute is perfectly in force, and this mechanism is aimed at enhancing its validity and integrity. And the declaratory award providing for an objective,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's request is aimed at obtaining: " recognition of a situation at law, once and for all and with binding force as between the Parties; so that the legal position thus established cannot again be called into question in so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned."	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law. In fact, in Northern Cameroons, the court declined to exercise its jurisdiction because the treaty at issue had been terminated. Differently in the present case, the Treaty whose interpretation is in dispute is perfectly in force, and this mechanism is aimed at enhancing its validity and integrity. And the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	judicial propriety. Pakistan is not seeking, as Ukraine did, a declaration recognising its compliance with its obligations under the Treaty, let alone to the effect of preempting future claims arising from different sets of circumstances. Rather, Pakistan is seeking, in this phase of the case, an award that addresses a long-standing dispute between the parties on questions of systemic interpretation of the Treaty. And this falls squarely within the scope of Article IX(1) of the Treaty. It is therefore clear that entertaining Pakistan's request would be a legitimate exercise of this Court's jurisdiction, and would not contradict the principles of judicial propriety. Using the words of the Permanent Court in the Chorzów interpretation judgment, Pakistan's request is aimed at obtaining: " recognition of a situation at law, once and for all and with binding force as between the Parties; so that the legal position thus established cannot again be called into question in so far as the legal effects ensuing therefrom are concerned."	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 appropriateness, usefulness and need for the Court to render a declaratory award in the form of a narrative judgment, the ICJ in Northern Cameroons, amongst others, provides valuable guidance. The first factor that emerges from the court's reasoning is the need for "forward reach" of the adjudicative decision. As already mentioned, the court stressed that: " if in a declaratory judgment it expounds a rule of customary law or interprets a treaty which remains in force, its judgment has a continuing applicability." In other words, declaratory adjudication of the kind requested by Pakistan is appropriate when the award can be applied to the parties' future conduct and ensure compliance with obligations in force under international law. In fact, in Northern Cameroons, the court declined to exercise its jurisdiction because the treaty at issue had been terminated. Differently in the present case, the Treaty whose interpretation is in dispute is perfectly in force, and this mechanism is aimed at enhancing its validity and integrity. And the declaratory award providing for an objective,

15:17	1 provisions would have the necessary "for		limits or reasons of judicial propriety, which we have
	2 effectively resolve the dispute between		
	3 Mr Chairman, members of the Court,	-	i i
	4 the "forward reach" factor underscores t	the need for 4	circumstances of that case:
	5 a decision that can be operationalised an	nd applied in 5	e .
	6 practice. This is precisely why Pakistan	n requests 6	selecting the most simple, concise, and expeditious
	7 a clear and comprehensive statement by	your Court of the 7	solution, such considerations are not the only
	8 parties' rights and obligations under the	Treaty in the 8	legitimate factor for the Court."
	9 form it has requested.	9	Along the same lines, Judge Gaja, in his declaration
1	10 Another distinguishing factor determined	ining the 10	in Obligations Concerning Negotiations Relating to
1	11 appropriateness of rendering a declarato	bry judgment may 11	Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race, observed that,
1	12 be drawn from the ICJ jurisprudence on	the circumstances 12	whilst one can see a minimalist decision as
1	13 dictating the need for articulation and pr	recision of the 13	an application of judicial economy, "judicial economy
1	14 declaratory relief. In the Jan Mayen cas	se, the court 14	may also require the Court to take a decision on certain
1	15 observed that:	15	issues that were raised", and could be the object of new
1	16 "To give only a broad indication of th	ne manner in 16	proceedings between the same parties "when these
1	17 which the definition of the delimitation	line should be 17	proceedings are a distinct possibility".
1	18 fixed, and to leave the matter for the fur	rther agreement 18	
1	19 of the Parties, as urged by Norway, wou	uld in the Court's 19	
2	20 view not be a complete discharge of its		
	21 determine the dispute."	21	
	22 While the ICJ decision was taken in t		
	23 contrary position of the claimant, Norwa		e ·
	raising ne ultra petita concerns, no such		
	arise in the instant proceedings, for it is		
	Page 185		Page 187
15:18	1 applicant that urges an articulated and	precise 15:22 1	may be precluded from adjudicating points not arising
	2 declaratory award.	2	out of issues in dispute. Conversely, if the applicant
	3 A third factor determining the approx	opriateness of 3	presents a certain narrative dispositif as a necessary
	4 rendering a detailed declaratory relief	pertains to the 4	element in the award for it to settle the disputes
			element in the award for it to settle the disputes
	5 question of judicial economy; or, actua	ally, to the need 5	-
	question of judicial economy; or, actualof avoiding the risk of exercising false	-	before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no
		judicial 6	before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the
	6 of avoiding the risk of exercising false	e judicial 6 nces of the case. 7	before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so.
	6 of avoiding the risk of exercising false7 economy under the specific circumstant	e judicial 6 nces of the case. 7 l (paragraph 13.10), 8	before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly
	of avoiding the risk of exercising falseeconomy under the specific circumstanAs Pakistan submitted in its Memorial	e judicial 6 nces of the case. 7 l (paragraph 13.10), 8 an economy of 9	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope
-	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstant As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a 	a judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the
-	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstant As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties we 	a judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed
-	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstan As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties we It is not disputed that Court has the 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstan As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties we It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago:
-	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstant As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties weight It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba and is not obliged to examine all the court 	a judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstant As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties weight It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba and is not obliged to examine all the court advanced by the parties. However, as 	a judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstan As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties we It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba and is not obliged to examine all the co advanced by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14ion in1516	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstan As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties we It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba and is not obliged to examine all the co advanced by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin Norwegian Loans: 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14ion in15e Court is17	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and uncomplicated dispositif could suffice. But since my
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstant As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties weight in the ground upon which it will be and is not obliged to examine all the context of by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin Norwegian Loans: " a Party to proceedings before the 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14tion in15e Court is17all give as18	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and uncomplicated dispositif could suffice. But since my arrival at the Court in 1995, I have noted that very
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstant As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties weight It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba and is not obliged to examine all the court advanced by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin Norwegian Loans: " a Party to proceedings before the entitled to expect that its Judgment share 	a judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9bell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14tion in15e Court is17all give as18asic aspects of19	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and uncomplicated dispositif could suffice. But since my arrival at the Court in 1995, I have noted that very detailed findings on diverse points of law are required
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstan As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties we It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba and is not obliged to examine all the co advanced by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin Norwegian Loans: " a Party to proceedings before the entitled to expect that its Judgment sha accurate a picture as possible of the ba 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14tion in15e Court is17all give as18asic aspects of19y."20	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and uncomplicated dispositif could suffice. But since my arrival at the Court in 1995, I have noted that very detailed findings on diverse points of law are required and, moreover, the declaration of the substantive
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstan As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties we It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba and is not obliged to examine all the co advanced by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin Norwegian Loans: " a Party to proceedings before the entitled to expect that its Judgment sha accurate a picture as possible of the ba the legal position adopted by that Party 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14ion in15e Court is17all give as18asic aspects of19y."20l principle21	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and uncomplicated dispositif could suffice. But since my arrival at the Court in 1995, I have noted that very detailed findings on diverse points of law are required and, moreover, the declaration of the substantive violation is less frequently found to be a sufficient
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstant As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties wee It is not disputed that Court has the is select the ground upon which it will be and is not obliged to examine all the court advanced by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin Norwegian Loans: " a Party to proceedings before the entitled to expect that its Judgment sha accurate a picture as possible of the ba the legal position adopted by that Party As he put it, it is a sound procedural that an adjudicative decision "should adopted by 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14tion in15e Court is17all give as18asic aspects of19y."20l principle21attach to the22	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and uncomplicated dispositif could suffice. But since my arrival at the Court in 1995, I have noted that very detailed findings on diverse points of law are required and, moreover, the declaration of the substantive violation is less frequently found to be a sufficient remedy."
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstant As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties wee It is not disputed that Court has the is select the ground upon which it will be and is not obliged to examine all the court advanced by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin Norwegian Loans: " a Party to proceedings before the entitled to expect that its Judgment sha accurate a picture as possible of the ba the legal position adopted by that Party As he put it, it is a sound procedural that an adjudicative decision "should a 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14tion in15e Court is17all give as18asic aspects of19y."20l principle21attach to the22though not23	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and uncomplicated dispositif could suffice. But since my arrival at the Court in 1995, I have noted that very detailed findings on diverse points of law are required and, moreover, the declaration of the substantive violation is less frequently found to be a sufficient remedy."
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstant As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties weight It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba and is not obliged to examine all the court advanced by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin Norwegian Loans: " a Party to proceedings before the entitled to expect that its Judgment sha accurate a picture as possible of the ba the legal position adopted by that Party As he put it, it is a sound procedural that an adjudicative decision "should a submissions of the Parties a purpose, t 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14tion in15e Court is17all give as18asic aspects of19y."20l principle21attach to the22though not23s attached to24	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and uncomplicated dispositif could suffice. But since my arrival at the Court in 1995, I have noted that very detailed findings on diverse points of law are required and, moreover, the declaration of the substantive violation is less frequently found to be a sufficient remedy." As your Court observed in Procedural Order 6 (paragraph 30), the overarching duty of international
	 of avoiding the risk of exercising false economy under the specific circumstan As Pakistan submitted in its Memorial in the context of the present dispute, "a reasoning will not serve the parties we It is not disputed that Court has the select the ground upon which it will ba and is not obliged to examine all the co advanced by the parties. However, as Judge Lauterpacht in his separate opin Norwegian Loans: " a Party to proceedings before the entitled to expect that its Judgment sha accurate a picture as possible of the ba the legal position adopted by that Party As he put it, it is a sound procedural that an adjudicative decision "should a submissions of the Parties a purpose, t necessarily an effect, which the parties 	e judicial6nces of the case.7l (paragraph 13.10),8an economy of9ell".10freedom to11ase its judgment12onsiderations13noted by14tion in15e Court is17all give as18asic aspects of19y."20l principle21attach to the22though not23s attached to24	 before the Court, and the latter agrees, there are no impediments for the Court to adopt that approach; on the contrary, there is solid ground for it to do so. Pakistan, in asking for this approach, is certainly not asking the Court to push extravagantly the envelope of procedural canons. As former President of the International Court of Justice Rosalyn Higgins observed before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly almost 20 years ago: "For many years, it was usual for the Court to be asked by one party simply for a declaration of a breach of an obligation by the other party A short and uncomplicated dispositif could suffice. But since my arrival at the Court in 1995, I have noted that very detailed findings on diverse points of law are required and, moreover, the declaration of the substantive violation is less frequently found to be a sufficient remedy." As your Court observed in Procedural Order 6 (paragraph 30), the overarching duty of international

		1	
15.02 1	and have been	15.06 1	lan mana shat ann shara drama inta it arian dianaasian
15:23 1	authority: " in such a manner as to facilitate the actual	15:26 1	language that somehow draws into it prior discussion.
2	resolution of the Parties' dispute and to avoid the	2	I'm not asking you to respond to those possibilities
3	-	3	at this time; I'm just signalling that's the way I am
4	risks of duplicative proceedings or conflicting	4	thinking about the possibilities.
5	decisions."	5	And to the extent that you do have examples of
6	Pakistan believes that it is only through a robustly	6	number 2 and number 3, that would be helpful. That is,
7	reasoned and precisely targeted dispositif that your	7	if you have an example of a narrative dispositif in
8	award may fulfil that function. An abstract and	8	another proceeding that provides a sense of what it is
9	succinct formulation in the operative part of the	9	Pakistan might be looking for, I think it would be
10	Court's interpretation of the provisions in dispute	10	helpful for the Court to see that. If there are
11	would not serve the parties or the integrity of the	11	examples of the cross-reference-style dispositif, that
12	Treaty, including consistency between its mechanisms of	12	would be helpful as well.
13	dispute settlement. Accordingly, Pakistan respectfully	13	So that's, I suppose, more just an opening point
14	requests the inclusion of a carefully framed narrative	14	that I would make.
15	dispositif in the award as the most effective means to	15	My second thought is how we might be thinking about
16	impart clarity, predictability and finality to the	16	decisions that have been reached by other tribunals in
17	resolution of the disputes before you.	17	the sense of phased decision-making, because I do think
18	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this concludes my	18	that's what we're talking about here. We're talking
19	speech and I thank you for your attention, and I may	19	about as I think you well phrased it, there's
20	kindly ask you to call Sir Daniel to the podium for the	20	a concrete dispute about two particular plants that is
21	closing submissions; unless you have questions, of	21	currently before this Court, and what I think we've
22	course.	22	decided is we need to address some systemic issues
23	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Tanzi. Let me see if	23	before we can get to those disputes.
24	I have questions from any of my colleagues here.	24	That strikes me as somewhat similar to what we have
25	I have just a couple of my own then. So I will	25	seen in other courts and tribunals. The Iran-US Claims
	Page 189		Page 191
15:24 1	detain you at the podium for just a few more moments.	15:28 1	Tribunal has done a series of interpretative decisions
15:24 1 2	(3.25 pm)	15:28 1 2	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might
	(3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT		that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took
2	(3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three	2 3 4	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would
2 3	(3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT	2 3	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took
2 3 4 5 6	(3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here.	2 3 4 5 6	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you
2 3 4 5 6 7	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the 	2 3 4 5 6 7	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have value in terms of providing not just guidance to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not advisory opinions and are not viewed that way by anyone,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have value in terms of providing not just guidance to the parties, but an appreciation of the binding quality and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not advisory opinions and are not viewed that way by anyone, and whether it provides guidance to this Court?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have value in terms of providing not just guidance to the parties, but an appreciation of the binding quality and significance of it.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not advisory opinions and are not viewed that way by anyone, and whether it provides guidance to this Court? And then the last of my reflections is to think
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have value in terms of providing not just guidance to the parties, but an appreciation of the binding quality and significance of it. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not advisory opinions and are not viewed that way by anyone, and whether it provides guidance to this Court? And then the last of my reflections is to think a little bit more about the text of the Treaty, which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have value in terms of providing not just guidance to the parties, but an appreciation of the binding quality and significance of it. And then the third possibility I think I signalled a little earlier in the week of an approach that you 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not advisory opinions and are not viewed that way by anyone, and whether it provides guidance to this Court? And then the last of my reflections is to think a little bit more about the text of the Treaty, which you didn't really spend much time on in your
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have value in terms of providing not just guidance to the parties, but an appreciation of the binding quality and significance of it. And then the third possibility I think I signalled a little earlier in the week of an approach that you might call a "cross-reference dispositif", where the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not advisory opinions and are not viewed that way by anyone, and whether it provides guidance to this Court? And then the last of my reflections is to think a little bit more about the text of the Treaty, which you didn't really spend much time on in your presentation, and perhaps that will come with
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	(3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have value in terms of providing not just guidance to the parties, but an appreciation of the binding quality and significance of it. And then the third possibility I think I signalled a little earlier in the week of an approach that you might call a "cross-reference dispositif", where the dispositif perhaps is not quite as long as your	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not advisory opinions and are not viewed that way by anyone, and whether it provides guidance to this Court? And then the last of my reflections is to think a little bit more about the text of the Treaty, which you didn't really spend much time on in your presentation, and perhaps that will come with Sir Daniel. But I was looking at Article IX of the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 (3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have value in terms of providing not just guidance to the parties, but an appreciation of the binding quality and significance of it. And then the third possibility I think I signalled a little earlier in the week of an approach that you might call a "cross-reference dispositif", where the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not advisory opinions and are not viewed that way by anyone, and whether it provides guidance to this Court? And then the last of my reflections is to think a little bit more about the text of the Treaty, which you didn't really spend much time on in your presentation, and perhaps that will come with
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	(3.25 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that there are at least three types of dispositif that one might be contemplating here. So the first would be what you might call the "normal" dispositif: relatively brief in nature, perhaps akin to what we had in the decision on the competence of the Court; a well-reasoned series of paragraphs preceding it that help us understand what that dispositif means. I understand that's not what Pakistan is asking for in this instance. That leads to a second possibility, which I think you've called a more "narrative dispositif", that would contain within that dispositif a much more robust discussion of the issues and findings that might have value in terms of providing not just guidance to the parties, but an appreciation of the binding quality and significance of it. And then the third possibility I think I signalled a little earlier in the week of an approach that you might call a "cross-reference dispositif", where the dispositif perhaps is not quite as long as your	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	that then provide guidance for how cases before it might unfold. The Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission took decisions that provided guidance as to how claims would unfold before it. Even the International Court of Justice, as I think you've been indicating, when you look at a phased case, even if you want to approach it as merits/reparations, typically it's a very extensive amount of guidance to the parties as to the contours of the dispute and what's proper and improper under a particular treaty that provides the guidance thereafter. So I'd be interested in reflections you have on those types of examples as well. So the first set of examples is: what does a dispositif look like? The second set of examples is: how might we be thinking about these phased processes, which clearly are not advisory opinions and are not viewed that way by anyone, and whether it provides guidance to this Court? And then the last of my reflections is to think a little bit more about the text of the Treaty, which you didn't really spend much time on in your presentation, and perhaps that will come with Sir Daniel. But I was looking at Article IX of the

2"Any question larising between the Parkies3(regarding) interpretations or application of this4Trunty".5In the daws have a precase for a Normal Figure6that clearly is a mach more focused, plant-specific7process, but als a process hollow a Court of8Arbitrain. It users hole was cloar of9up the reporturity for the kind of planes process but9up the reporturity for the kind of planes process but9up the reporturity for the kind of planes process but10user currently engaged any, and but prefers some11appects of that reary could be brough to beer as ave12this brough the process of the aver of the law but and but mose, hut13the propriety of (t, as you've been discussing before14so you're weeknet.1516so you're weeknet.17break town, and liken the first18start querk maximum as in the king point. It point19will be critikity room the weeknet.10THE (CHARMAN: Now, and liken the law solubid.10the propriety of the second by solub on a preference11grade to declaratory trans. Sin Datak plant12week. But a latic fraged in my speech. It and13grade to declaratory trans. Sin Datak plant14to how any noccell.151516star querk maximum come up17break town, and liken the law international.18star parties. In a booking town in the proticular tr	15:29 1	bit on the way in which it opens up:	15:33 1	to the forward reach of what we expect of the award.
 frequencing — interpretation or application of dis. Then does have a process for a Neutral Expert then does have a process for a Neutral Expert then does have a process for a Neutral Expert then does have a process for a Neutral Expert then does have a process for a Neutral Expert then does have a process for a Neutral Expert appeter optimum for the kind of phasa presentite appeter optimum for the kind of phasa presents the regarding — interpretation of the kind of phasa presents the does have a process for a Neutral Expert think theough the long for the series does have of the text could be bought to bear a we think theough the ind preshap score think theough the ind preshap score think theough the score a we think theough the process that we's undertaking, and the colek and noting that we might process that we's undertaking, and a cole board to bear a we think theough the process over the weekend. so you're weekend and the cole hast point of a score over the weekend. weith a calcie caction a board for a process over the weekend. gaing to address banically the form of the ratief we are address does and indigated in my speech. I am address does and indigated in my speech. I am address does and indigated in the ratief we are (3.34 pro) you of mich chardmany terms. Str Daniel will address does and consign there were and and indigated in the applicable of a score and and a the analysis. And there is anyte language anied at a score and and a score and and a score and and a score aneot and a score aneot and a score aneot and a score and a sc	2		2	
 Tensy⁵. The docs have a process for a Normal Expert the docs have a process for a Normal Expert the docs have a process for a Normal Expert the docs have a process for a Normal Expert the docs have a process for a Normal Expert appets of that is constant of the sing of paragores state appets of that the rights and obligations of Creatia and Slovenia the oppotentially in put y the saved shall substitute. In looking the oppotential for the kind of plans-specific the oppotential for the specific of it, as you're been discussing before as Struct as solven to post take that no board for the transk you. MC hairman. I think it probably will be addressed certainly by fir Daniel, or at least that quark reaction as to be liss pirit: the point as dates shacial the form of the reliaf ware as dates shacial the form of the reliaf ware as share you, which wall the order ware as share you, which wall anticipated in my speech. I am the advect of the next specific or the ware as share you way contain simetry interval. The part 100 the property of it, as you're weeked. the property of it, as you're weeked. the advect of the first is copolicit on the advect and the properties of the parties conce	3		3	obligation arising out of a written source, be it
6that clearly is a much more focused, plast-specific7process, but doe groups before 3 Courd8Arbitration. It seems like, within that text, it opens9up the opportunity for the kind of phasel process that10use are currently engaged upon, and the profuse opon.11aspects of that text could be brought to berra as we12thit formage the opportunity of it, as you've been discussing before13as we've been discussing before14use.15So you've been discussing before16we've abscelections over the weekend.17reflections over the weekend.18PROFESSOR TANZ: Thank you very much. At Chairman. There19Wet certainly own for reflection over the weekend.20Bar a quick reaction as to the kerp bett into point21wet here as a taintight we form of the eller we are22by way of and class bascial, a form of incorregations are one weekend.23next week. Bar as I anticipation with respects to what may screeu proposition in the and24asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Duniel will25asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Duniel will26As far as the first two questions are concerned,3we regard your question about cross-referencing by the3glopositif visi-a-vis the protection or the weard or jadipment does indeed address3glopositif visi-a-vis the protection or the weard or pagement does indeed address4as capanitie that event of the consert free or most here or protection or the weard or pageme	4	Treaty".	4	
6that clearly is a much more focused, plast-specific7process, but doe groups before 3 Courd8Arbitration. It seems like, within that text, it opens9up the opportunity for the kind of phasel process that10use are currently engaged upon, and the profuse opon.11aspects of that text could be brought to berra as we12thit formage the opportunity of it, as you've been discussing before13as we've been discussing before14use.15So you've been discussing before16we've abscelections over the weekend.17reflections over the weekend.18PROFESSOR TANZ: Thank you very much. At Chairman. There19Wet certainly own for reflection over the weekend.20Bar a quick reaction as to the kerp bett into point21wet here as a taintight we form of the eller we are22by way of and class bascial, a form of incorregations are one weekend.23next week. Bar as I anticipation with respects to what may screeu proposition in the and24asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Duniel will25asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Duniel will26As far as the first two questions are concerned,3we regard your question about cross-referencing by the3glopositif visi-a-vis the protection or the weard or jadipment does indeed address3glopositif visi-a-vis the protection or the weard or pagement does indeed address4as capanitie that event of the consert free or most here or protection or the weard or pageme	5	It then does have a process for a Neutral Expert	5	interestingly, in part V, the arbitral tribunal stressed
 process, but do a process before 1 court of Arbitration. It seems like, within that text, is open grip the opportunity for the kind of phasal process that we are currently engaged upon, and that perhaps some grip the opportunity of the kind of phasal process that we are currently engaged upon, and that perhaps some think through this process that we text out has a weak think through this process that we text out be brody it to hear a weak think through this process that we text out board for reflections over the weakend. Broder also welcance to institute that to board for reflections over the weakend. weak. But a 1 anisely some of the reflections over the weakend. gring to address basically the form of the reliaf ware asking you for in declaratory terms. Sit Daniel, or at least gring to address basically the form of the reliaf ware asking you for in declaratory terms. Sit Daniel will gring to address basically the form of the reliaf ware asking you for in declaratory terms. Sit Daniel will gring to adverse to the more that weak and a spossibility in order to meet the coucrems that I have gring to adverse to the more of existing renders or previons. the repreduct metry form (incorporation in the day apossibility in order to use the sourcems that I have gring the type of this the very much and of an associal and income the sweak of the tart have the rest weak remaining from the award or independent durings. the apossibility in order to meet the coucrems that I have gring the approach of existing rendent op reliable in the system that that that that that that that tha	6		6	
 Adviration. It seems the, within that text, it opens up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity for the kind of phased process that up the opportunity of it, as you're maps developed on the opportunity of the kind phased process that the opportunity of the process of the opportunity of the pr	7		7	
 p up the coportunity for the kind of phased process that we are currently cagaged upon, and that perfussions a spects of that text could be brought to har as we think through this process that we're undertaking, and the propriety of it, a you're been discussing before us. So you're veloce to respond to any of that row, hat so you're also welcants to respond to any of that row, hat p you're also welcants to respond to any of that row, hat more the veleand. the adjukt certain to the faith print. the adjukt certain the print. p and quick reaction over the weeknet. p and quick reaction over the weeknet. more week. But a 1 antispated in my specers. a king you for in declaration trans. Fit Paniel will g gatg on with substance. As far as the first two questions are concerned, which 1 see very mutch as intertwined, 1 anticipated that we regard your question as a intertwined, 1 anticipated that we regard your question how questions are concerned, the print mentioned, hat it may be relevant and of g assibility in order to meet the concerns that I have j adjuments, and there is where I see very mutch a coubulation: at I said, a form of incorporation in the d apossibility in order to meet the concerns that I have j adjuments, and there is where I see very mutch a responded dispositif. As and the to draw your attention to a case that I haverin mentioned, hat it may be relevant and of assing for - and you're also that we were and and grassing for - and you're also that were and	8			-
 10 we are currently engaged upon, and that perhaps some as we in thick through the process that we's undertaking, and in the propriety of it, as you've been discussing before it. 11 as peets of that exx coald be brought to bear as we in thick through the propriety of it, as you've been discussing before it. 13 as point we become to respond to any of that now, but you're hange to do so to take the item back as a preference it as to how we percect? 14 as to how we percect? 15 Su you're hange to any of that now, but you're hange to do so, to take the item back as available. 14 the certainly rom for reflection ore the weekend. 15 BR DANEL: Thank you. MC Chairman. Think it prohably to do so, to take the item back as available. 16 The CHAIRMAN: Very good. Then I propose we come back at 4 of clock and resume. 21 will be addressed certainly by Sir Daniel, or at least 22 by any of anticipated with respect to what may come up as aking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel we are as aking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel we are a stating you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel we are a aking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel we are a asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel we are a asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel we are a asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel we are a previous reasoning very much as a nordbattory, as have the ready or you go you have a preference and you we grand your question about cross. Therefore, and by the subscince of the work and the second. 15.31 1 get on within substance. 20 There have been cases. which will be submitted to the ergend you registing to ready the participation with respect to saving for the as sing a form of incorporation in the dispositif, you ergend your good south as a strate to you, which is Cotatia vergend but to good sind. 21 diagonitif shate the astronation theore is any pelangement does indeed address inter	9			
11aspects of that text could be knowly to hear as we that having this process that we're undertaking, and 1311So I dink we have a prediction in the table is you're who we have a prediction over the a statistic is you're who we have a prediction over the propriety of it, is you're who we have a prediction over the weeknd. 1411So I dink we have a prediction is into its product table is provide the weeknd. 1516you're also welcome to just take that on heard for reflections over the weeknd. 2015SIR DANEL: Thank you, MC tairman. Think it probably to so, to take the weeknd is a landicipation with respect to what may come up a near quick reaction is the priori 2116would be sensible, if you're happy to do so, to take the weeknd is a landicipation in you prove up (A short break).171622we week. But is a landicipation in you prove the weeknd. 231818181824gring to address basically the form of the relief we are a aking your for in declaraony terms. Sir Daniel will we regard your question about cross-referencing by the d dispositif Vis - Avis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as 1 sid, a form of incorporation in the regard your question about cross-referencing by the d dispositif Vis - Avis the previous reasoning very much a expanded dispositif.15.591podium. So when you're ready, please proceed. 215.311get on with substance.15.591podium. So when you're ready, please proceed. 215.311get on with substance.15.5912As far as the first two questions are concerns that 1 have g ust expressed.15.59	10		10	
 12 thick through this process that we're undertaking, and 13 the propriety of it, as you're been discussing before 14 us. 15 Su you're velcome to respond to any of that now, but 16 you're also velcome to respond to any of that now, but 17 reflections over the weekend. 18 PROFESSOR TANZE: Thank you KPC hairman. There 19 will be cartainly room for reflection over the weekend. 20 War a quick reaction as to the last point: the point 21 with be addressed certainly by Sir Daniel or at least 22 by way of auticipated in my speech. I am 23 nest week. But as 1 anticipated in my speech. I am 24 as the first two questions are concerned, 31 witch I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that 32 dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have 34 a quide not does indee daddress 35 Storenia - actually, not versus, because they came to 34 adjong to the assing treaties or previous 35 adjong to the reak you are assing treaties or previous 34 adjong to the sing the origonation in the 34 apossibility in order to meet the concerns that I have 35 and and the origonation in the 35 and and the reis where I see very much 35 an extually, not versus, because they came to 35 adjong to the reak and origing that are optical. 35 adjong to the reak and the responded to reak and the responded possitif. And the nordi. 35 adjong to the reak and roing matheses were reference to 36 apossitif by reference to the monit, which could be assistance to you, which is Coatia very much as interpretation either of existing treaties or previous 36 apossitif by arelevan to the souride dadressi 	11		11	
13the propriety of it, as you've been discussing before14us.15So you're also velcome to respond to any of that now, but16you're also velcome to just take that on board for17reflections were the veekend.18PROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. There19will be certainly nom for reflection over the veekend.20Bit a quick reaction as to the stay form of the cellet we are21will be advised certainly by Sir Daniel, or at least22by way of anticipation with respect to what may come up23next week. Rut at a funcipated in my speech, 1 am24going to address basically the from of the cellet we are25asking you for in delanatory terms. Sir Daniel will26As far as the first two questions are concerned,3which 1 see very much. 1 anticipated that4we regard your question about cross-referencing by the5dispositif vis-a-vis the previous reasoning very much as6an odulation; as 1 staid, a form of incorporation in the7dispositif, by reference to the motif, which could be8apposibility in order to meet the concerns that 1 have9just expressed.10There have been cases, which will be submitted to11guidament does indeed address12interpretation either of existing retaise or previous13and late the fiel say by the avaite of updament does indeed address14an expanded dispositif,15And I would like to drawy your attention to a c	12		12	
14us.14as to how we proceed?15So you're welcome to isst take that on board for15SIR DANIEL: Thank you, we proceed?16you're also welcome to just take that on board for16wou'd be sensible, if you're happy to do so, to take the17reflections over the weekend.17break now, and then II have a clear run. And I will18PROFESSOR TANZ: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. There18simply cut my cloh to suit the time that's available.19will be addressed cernishy by Er Daniel, car at least13(3.4 pm)21way or anticipation with respect to what may come up23(3.59 pm)22is you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will23(3.59 pm)23nost week. But as latidiopation sare concerned,24Siretch, at least for today. We have Sir Daniel at the24As far as the first two questions are concerned,15.591podium. So when you're randy, please proceed.25asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will5.591podium. So when you're randy, please proceed.25As far as the first two questions are concerned,15.591podium. So when you're randy, please proceed.3which I see very much as intertwined. I anticipated that4SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, nembers of the Court.3by obsitif vip reference to the motif, which could be as apossibility in order to meet the concerns that Have54an expanded dispositif.1Mr Chairman, you adant, serience, not what we are3inte	13			
 So you're who welcome to respond to any of that now, but you're also welcome to just take that on board for you're also welcome to just take that on board for predictions over the weekend. BROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you very much. Mr Chairman. There will be certainly nom for reflection over the weekend. Bu a quick reaction as to the last point: the point and strategistic parties in the point. and strategistic parties in the point. asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will Page 193 If get on with substance. As far as the first two questions are concerned. which I see very much as intertwined. I anticipated that we regard your question abour to except the substance. a staid, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the molify which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have judgments, and there i swhere I see very much as a net subsch the of dways our attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which its foronit. Near I have I see very much as a necymaded dispositif. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the draw you aratention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which its foronit we relave our attention to faces that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which its croasits of Reporting be that parention of the applicable language aimed at providing guidance to be particely languiting of the applicable language aimed at permanence and, lets say, the duration of the legal the repretation of the asys, the duration of the legal the repretation of the may since, thick is a point linked a key and the	14		14	
16 you're also welcome to just take that on heard for 16 would be sensible, if you're happy to do so, to take the 17 reflections over the weekend. 17 treach ow, and then III have a clear run. And I will 18 PROPESSOR TANZ; 18 simply cut my cloth to suit the time that's available. 20 But a quick reaction as to the last point 19 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Then I propose we come back at 21 will be addressed certainly by Sir Daniel, or at least 21 (3.34 µm) 22 by way of anticipation with respects to what may come up 23 is ware week. But as a functionation my sepech. I am 23 next week. But as a functionation my sepech. I am 23 (3.59 µm) 24 going to address basically the form of the relief we are 23 (3.54 µm) 25 asking you for in declanatory terms. Sir Daniel will 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So I do think we're in the end 25 asking you for in declanatory terms. Sir Daniel will 26 SiR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. 26 As far as the first two questions are concerned, 15.59 1 podium. So when you're ready, please proceed. 27 Ishorif Arereference to the moidi, which could be aspoi	15	So you're welcome to respond to any of that now, but	15	-
17 reflections over the weekend. 18 PROFESSOR TANZE: Thusk you very much, Mr Chairman. There 19 will be certaily noor for reflection over the weekend. 20 But a quick reaction as to the last print: the point 21 will be addressed certainly by Sir Daniel, or at least 22 by way of anticipation with respect to what may come up 23 next week. But as lanticipated in my speech. I am 24 reging to address basically the form of the relief we are 25 asking you for ideclaratory terms. Sir Daniel will 26 Page 193 27 Page 193 28 Page 195 15:51 1 16:53 1 29 stretch, at least for today. We have Sir Daniel at the 20 As far as the first two questions are concerned, 3 which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that 4 we regard your question about cross-referencing by the 5 dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be 6 a modulation; as 1 suid, a form of incorporation in the 7 dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be 8 a posstability in order to meet	16		16	
 will be certainly room for reflection over the weekend. But a quick reaction as to the last point: the point will be addressed certainly by Str Doniel, or at least by way of anticipation with respect to what may come up next week. But as lanticipated in my speech, I am get on with substance. As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined. I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have possibility in order to resusting treaties or previous pidgments, and there is where I see very much that Pavent mentioned, but it may be relevant and of six parties. And there is sconcerning that very mentione to possitif, consisting of six parties. And there is simple language aimed at permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 	17		17	
 will be certainly room for reflection over the weekend. But a quick reaction as to the last point: the point. will be addressed certainly by Sir Doniel, or at least. hy way of anticipation with respect to what may come up next week. But as lanticipated in my speech. I am going to address basically the form of the relief we are asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will Page 193 15:59 1 podium. So when you're ready, please proceed. SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply dispositif yirs-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which is cours, where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your autention to a case that Haver'n mentioned, but it may be relevant and of six parties. And there is simple language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning tis quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is simple language aimed at permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 	18	PROFESSOR TANZI: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. There	18	simply cut my cloth to suit the time that's available.
 But a quick reaction as to the last point: the point will be addressed certainly by Sir Daniel, or at least yway of anticipated in my speech, I am going to address basically the form of the relief we are asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will Fage 193 1 get on with substance. As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif yr efference to the motif, which could be a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and thre is where I see very much a expanded dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at tris quite an elaborat dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning tis squite an elaborat dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning tis squite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 	19			
 21 will be addressed certainly by Sir Daniel, or at least 22 by way of anticipation with respect to what may come up 23 next week. But as lanticipated in my speech, 1 am 24 gring to address basically the form of the relief we are 25 asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will Page 193 15:59 1 podium. So when you're ready, please proceed. 2 SIR DANIEL: 1 think before 1 get to my observations, so the Court. 3 Which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as 1 said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as 1 said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif vis-a-wis the row to judgment does indeed address 10 There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address 11 my ou, in which the award or judgment and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of 18 Slovenia – actually, not versus, because they came to 19 the arbitration tribunal by compromis. 11 is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parries. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning tis repretation of the applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 	20	-	20	
 by way of anticipation with respect to what may come up a next week. But as I anticipated in my speech, I am going to address basically the form of the relief we are asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will 23 (3.59 pm) 1 get on with substance. 2 As far as the first two questions are concerned, 3 which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. 10 There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous 13 judgments, and there is where I see very much as a cospanded dispositif. And there is where I see very much as a sistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of 14 assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of 15 six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning 13 interpretation of the relief we prease to you, which is Croatia v Republic of 18 Slovenia - actually, not versus, because they came to 19 the arbitration tribunal by compromis. 11 ti squite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of 18 six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning 13 interpretation of the applicit parties. 13 interpretation of the applicit parties concerning 14 permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal 25 effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 25 af you'll recall – and I think from memory it was 	21		21	(3.34 pm)
24 going to address basically the form of the relief we are 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So I do think we're in the end 25 asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will Page 193 Page 195 15:31 get on with substance. 2 As far as the first two questions are concerned, 3 3 which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the 5 5 dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as 6 a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the 7 dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have 9 just expressed. 10 There have been cases, which will be submitted to 10 There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address 11 you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous 13 judgments, and there is where I see very much as an eaboutel with in the arbitration tribunal by compromis. 16 that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of 13 Stovenia - actually, not versus, because they came to	22	by way of anticipation with respect to what may come up	22	
25 asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will 25 stretch, at least for today. We have Sir Daniel at the 15:31 1 get on with substance. 2 As far as the first two questions are concerned, 3 which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that 9 podium. So when you're ready, please proceed. 3 which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that 3 Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi 4 we regard your question about cross-referencing by the SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. 5 because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, 6 a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the 7 dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be 8 a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have 9 just expressed. 10 There have been cases, which will be submitted to 11 you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address 12 interpretation either of existing treaties or previous 13 judgments, and there is where I see very much 14 an expanded dispositif. 15 And I would like to draw your attention to a case th	23	next week. But as I anticipated in my speech, I am	23	(3.59 pm)
25 asking you for in declaratory terms. Sir Daniel will 25 stretch, at least for today. We have Sir Daniel at the 15:31 1 get on with substance. 15:31 1 get on with substance. 2 As far as the first two questions are concerned, 15:41 1 podium. So when you're ready, please proceed. 3 which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that 3 Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi 4 we regard your question about cross-referencing by the 5 SIR DANIEL: Think you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. 3 a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif vis-a-vis the previous reasoning very much as 6 6 a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the observations about them. And then T11 come back to my 9 just expressed. 0 There have been cases, which will be submitted to 10 There have been cases, which will be submitted to 10 overnight, not so scripted. 11 you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address 10 overnight, not so scripted. 12 faispositif, unt see very much as asking for - and you're absolutely right - not what 13 judgments, and there is where I see	24		24	-
Page 193Page 19515:31get on with substance.22As far as the first two questions are concerned,34wich lase very much as intertwined, I anticipated that24we regard your question about cross-referencing by the55dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as6a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the7dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be8a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have9just expressed.10There have been cases, which will be submitted to11you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address12interpretation either of existing treaties or previous13judgments, and there is where I see very much14an expanded dispositif.15And I would like to draw your attention to a case16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of17assitance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of17the arbitration tribunal by compromis.18Ti squite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of19interpretation of the applicable law, including the20interpretation of the applicable law, including the21interpretation of the applicable law, including the22interpretation of the applicable law, including the23interpretation of the applicable law, including the24satisport – and voir absolutely right – not what25stort-form dispositif because we think	25		25	stretch, at least for today. We have Sir Daniel at the
 15:31 1 get on with substance. 15:53 1 get on with substance. 15:54 1 get on with substance. 15:55 1 podium. So when you're ready, please proceed. 2 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. 3 which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that 4 we regard your question about cross-referencing by the 5 dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation: as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. 10 There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia - actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis. 11 is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpretation of the applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked a stored for and leas applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 		D 102		D 105
2As far as the first two questions are concerned,3which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that4we regard your question about cross-referencing by the5dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as6a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the7dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be8a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have9just expressed.10There have been cases, which will be submitted to11you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address12interpretation either of existing treaties or previous13judgments, and there is where I see very much14an expanded dispositif.15And I would like to draw your attention to a case16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of17assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, orbits includes the reasoning within the21six parties. And there is sample language aimed at22providing guidance to the parties concerning23interpretation of the applicable law, including the24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked		rage 195		rage 195
2As far as the first two questions are concerned,3which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that4we regard your question about cross-referencing by the5dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as6a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the7dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be8a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have9just expressed.10There have been cases, which will be submitted to11you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address12interpretation either of existing treaties or previous13judgments, and there is where I see very much14an expanded dispositif.15And I would like to draw your attention to a case16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of17assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, orbits includes the reasoning within the21six parties. And there is sample language aimed at22providing guidance to the parties concerning23interpretation of the applicable law, including the24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked				
 which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia - actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis. Ti squite an elaboratif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpretation of the applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 				
 4 we regard your question about cross-referencing by the 5 dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as 6 a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the 7 dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be 8 a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have 9 just expressed. 10 There have been cases, which will be submitted to 11 you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address 12 interpretation either of existing treaties or previous 13 judgments, and there is where I see very much 14 an expanded dispositif. 15 And I would like to draw your attention to a case 16 that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of 17 assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of 18 Slovnia actually, not versus, because they came to 19 the arbitration tribunal by compromis. 20 It is quite an elaborate dispositif consisting of 11 synites. And there is ample language aimed at 21 providing guidance to the parties concerning 22 interpretation of the applicable law, including the 23 effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 24 effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 25 affects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 26 affects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 	15:31	get on with substance.	15:59 1	podium. So when you're ready, please proceed.
5dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as5because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds,6a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have 95because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, 67dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have 96I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted.10There have been cases, which will be submitted to 1010overnight, not so scripted.11Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositif.11Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very 1313judgments, and there is where I see very much 14an expanded dispositif.14asking for and you're absolutely right not what 415And I would like to draw your attention to a case 1615we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative 416that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of 17161718Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to 1818short-form dispositif because we think that that's20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpre		-		
6a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed.6I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted.10There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif.10Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis.1120It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpretation of the applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked6I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared termarks; more prepared termarks; more prepared thut, given to veright, not does scripted.13judgments, and there is where I see very much that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at 	2	As far as the first two questions are concerned,	2	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court.
7dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be7questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two8a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have9observations about them. And then I'll come back to my9just expressed.9more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given10There have been cases, which will be submitted to1011you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address10overnight, not so scripted.12interpretation either of existing treaties or previous11Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of13judgments, and there is where I see very much13brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are14an expanded dispositif.14asking for and you're absolutely right not what15And I would like to draw your attention to a case15we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of16dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into22interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that	2 3	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi
8a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed.8observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given9just expressed.9more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given10There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif.10Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very13judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif.11Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very13premanence and, but it may be relevant and of 	2	As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the	2 3 4	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply
9just expressed.9more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given10There have been cases, which will be submitted to10overnight, not so scripted.11you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address11Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of12interpretation either of existing treaties or previous12dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very13judgments, and there is where I see very much13brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are14an expanded dispositif.14asking for and you're absolutely right not what15And I would like to draw your attention to a case15we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of16dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into22providing guidance to the parties concerning22difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, th	2	As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as	2 3 4 5	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court.Observations on the Court's questions to Professor TanziSIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds,
10There have been cases, which will be submitted to10overnight, not so scripted.11you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address11Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of12interpretation either of existing treaties or previous12dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very13judgments, and there is where I see very much13brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are14an expanded dispositif.14asking for and you're absolutely right not what15And I would like to draw your attention to a case15we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of16dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into22providing guidance to the parties concerning22difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was <td></td> <td>As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the</td> <td>2 3 4 5 6</td> <td> SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last </td>		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the	2 3 4 5 6	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last
11you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address11Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of12interpretation either of existing treaties or previous12dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very13judgments, and there is where I see very much13brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are14an expanded dispositif.14asking for and you're absolutely right not what15And I would like to draw your attention to a case15we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of16dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be	2 3 4 5 6 7	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two
12interpretation either of existing treaties or previous12dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very13judgments, and there is where I see very much13brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are14an expanded dispositif.14asking for and you're absolutely right not what15And I would like to draw your attention to a case14asking for in this case. Second, the narrative16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of16dispositif, which includes the reasoning within the17assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of17dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my
13judgments, and there is where I see very much13brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are14an expanded dispositif.14asking for and you're absolutely right not what15And I would like to draw your attention to a case14asking for in this case. Second, the narrative16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of16dispositif, which includes the reasoning within the17assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of17dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted.
14an expanded dispositif.14asking for and you're absolutely right not what15And I would like to draw your attention to a case15we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of16dispositif, which includes the reasoning within the17assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of17dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of
15And I would like to draw your attention to a case15we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of16dispositif, which includes the reasoning within the16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of16dispositif, which includes the reasoning within the17assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of17dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very
16that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of16dispositif, which includes the reasoning within the17assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of17dispositif, which includes the reasoning within the18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into22providing guidance to the parties concerning22difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are
17assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of17dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into22providing guidance to the parties concerning22difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what
18Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to18the analysis. Just to tick them off.19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into22providing guidance to the parties concerning22difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative
19the arbitration tribunal by compromis.19As I say, we are not asking for the normal20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of20short-form dispositif because we think that that's21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into22providing guidance to the parties concerning22difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif, which includes the reasoning within the
20It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpretation of the applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked20short-form dispositif because we think that that's 2120six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpretation of the applicable law, including the effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked20short-form dispositif because we think that that's 2120short-form dispositif because we think that that's use a number of difficulties. Now, there and be a number of different ways that you could deal 2425effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked2526As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to
21six parties. And there is ample language aimed at21likely to get us not likely to get us into22providing guidance to the parties concerning22difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif, which includes the reasoning within the dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to the analysis. Just to tick them off.
22providing guidance to the parties concerning22difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there23interpretation of the applicable law, including the23may be a number of different ways that you could deal24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to the analysis. Just to tick them off. As I say, we are not asking for the normal
 interpretation of the applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked As you'll recall and I think from memory it was 		As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis. It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to the analysis. Just to tick them off. As I say, we are not asking for the normal short-form dispositif because we think that that's
24permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal24with it.25effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked25As you'll recall and I think from memory it was	2 2 3 2 4 3 4 4 5 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis. It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to the analysis. Just to tick them off. As I say, we are not asking for the normal short-form dispositif because we think that that's likely to get us not likely to get us into
25 effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked 25 As you'll recall and I think from memory it was	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis. It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to the analysis. Just to tick them off. As I say, we are not asking for the normal short-form dispositif because we think that that's likely to get us not likely to get us into difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there
	2 2 3 3 4 6 6 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 13 14 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 14	As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis. It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpretation of the applicable law, including the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to the analysis. Just to tick them off. As I say, we are not asking for the normal short-form dispositif because we think that that's likely to get us not likely to get us into difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there may be a number of different ways that you could deal
Page 194 Page 196	2 2 3 4 6 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 12 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis. It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpretation of the applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to the analysis. Just to tick them off. As I say, we are not asking for the normal short-form dispositif because we think that that's likely to get us not likely to get us into difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there may be a number of different ways that you could deal with it.
	2 2 3 4 6 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 12 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis. It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpretation of the applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to the analysis. Just to tick them off. As I say, we are not asking for the normal short-form dispositif because we think that that's likely to get us not likely to get us into difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there may be a number of different ways that you could deal with it.
	2 2 3 4 6 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 12 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	As far as the first two questions are concerned, which I see very much as intertwined, I anticipated that we regard your question about cross-referencing by the dispositif vis-à-vis the previous reasoning very much as a modulation; as I said, a form of incorporation in the dispositif by reference to the motif, which could be a possibility in order to meet the concerns that I have just expressed. There have been cases, which will be submitted to you, in which the award or judgment does indeed address interpretation either of existing treaties or previous judgments, and there is where I see very much an expanded dispositif. And I would like to draw your attention to a case that I haven't mentioned, but it may be relevant and of assistance to you, which is Croatia v Republic of Slovenia actually, not versus, because they came to the arbitration tribunal by compromis. It is quite an elaborate dispositif, consisting of six parties. And there is ample language aimed at providing guidance to the parties concerning interpretation of the applicable law, including the permanence and, let's say, the duration of the legal effects stemming from the award, which is a point linked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. Observations on the Court's questions to Professor Tanzi SIR DANIEL: I think before I get to my observations, simply because it's going to be fresh in everybody's minds, I thought I might just pick up, Mr Chairman, your last questions to Professor Tanzi and just make one or two observations about them. And then I'll come back to my more prepared remarks; more prepared but, given overnight, not so scripted. Mr Chairman, you identified three possible types of dispositifs that came to your mind: the normal one, very brief, staccato, sentence by sentence; not what we are asking for and you're absolutely right not what we're asking for in this case. Second, the narrative dispositif. And then the third, the cross-reference to the analysis. Just to tick them off. As I say, we are not asking for the normal short-form dispositif because we think that that's likely to get us not likely to get us into difficulties, but it may raise difficulties. Now, there may be a number of different ways that you could deal with it.

16:00 1	paragraph 13.14 of our Memorial where we addressed this,	16:03 1	around the interpretation of paragraph 23.
10.00 1	and then you picked up on this, Mr Chairman, in your	2	I should say that Professor Tanzi took you to some
3	questions to Mr Fietta the language of paragraph 23	3	of the ICJ decisions, and we hope to be able to provide
4	of Annexure G provides a little bit of uncertainty,	4	you next week with a table which elaborates on this in
5	because it doesn't talk about an award, but "Award" and	5	a little bit more detail. I, from my own practice and
6	then it's "accompanied by reasons". So one of the	6	experience, am aware, for example, of a whole host of
0 7	reasons why we were asking for the narrative dispositif	0 7	cases from the Iran-US Claims Tribunal which adopt this
8	was precisely to anticipate and avoid any uncertainty		kind of approach. Mr Chairman, you will be familiar
		8	
9 10	there.	9 10	with many of those. What immediately comes to mind are
10	But there may be many different ways of doing it without turning the whole of your award effectively into	10	cases like B61, probably B1, although I don't have that as closely in mind. My recollection is A15, probably
11	a dispositif.	11	A15(II.A); there are a whole series of decisions there.
	-		
13	We are attracted, at one level, by the possibility of a normal, reasonably short-form dispositif which	13	And the way in which the Iran-US Claims Tribunal has
14 15	cross-refers. And I'll come in just a moment to	14 15	worked, for those who are perhaps not so familiar with it, this was a tribunal that was established in
15	a number of examples of which I'm aware because there	15	1982/1983, following the Iranian Revolution and the
	a number of eases in which I have been involved.		rupture between the United States and Iran, but it's
17 18		17	-
	But I will just telegraph a potential difficulty which	18 19	only been coming to final awards, in some cases, in
19 20	you might want to bear in mind as you think about this. Normally one would get a dispositif and if there is	20	relatively recent years. And the tribunal of course has changed over time, so you've had a changing composition.
20 21	an argument about res judicata, what are the binding	20	And that tribunal, in the course of a single case,
21 22	parts of the award, then there would be the argument on	21 22	cases usually proceed inter-state cases usual proceed
22	the basis of the traditional jurisprudence that in fact	22	by reference to names, so A-something or B-something
23 24	the reasoning is incorporated into the dispositif. And	23	those cases usually proceed by way of a series of
24 25	most of the jurisprudence of which we are aware reads	24	decisions, and they may be substantive decisions, not
23	most of the jurispludence of which we are aware reads	25	decisions, and they may be substantive decisions, not
	Page 197		Page 199
16:02 1	the reg judicate affect as breader then just the final		
1	the res judicata effect as broader than just the final	16:05 1	just case management decisions; and then you have
2	paragraphs, as you've heard.	16:05 1 2	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or
2 3	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif		a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on
2 3 4	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the	2 3 4	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing
2 3	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates	2 3	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final
2 3 4 5 6	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather	2 3 4 5 6	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts.
2 3 4 5 6 7	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included.	2 3 4 5 6 7	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and	2 3 4 5 6	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well, why haven't you referred to paragraph 322?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful mine to explore, particularly when it comes to claims
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well, why haven't you referred to paragraph 322? The whole raison d'être of the narrative dispositif	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful mine to explore, particularly when it comes to claims commissions. Mr Chairman, you mentioned the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well, why haven't you referred to paragraph 322? The whole raison d'être of the narrative dispositif was to make sure that what the parties received from you	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful mine to explore, particularly when it comes to claims commissions. Mr Chairman, you mentioned the Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission. And we're aware
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well, why haven't you referred to paragraph 322? The whole raison d'être of the narrative dispositif was to make sure that what the parties received from you was all-embracing, and that we wouldn't then be drawn	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful mine to explore, particularly when it comes to claims commissions. Mr Chairman, you mentioned the Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission. And we're aware that, for example, they sometimes have partial awards,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well, why haven't you referred to paragraph 322? The whole raison d'être of the narrative dispositif was to make sure that what the parties received from you was all-embracing, and that we wouldn't then be drawn into disputes about whether the short form actually	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful mine to explore, particularly when it comes to claims commissions. Mr Chairman, you mentioned the Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission. And we're aware that, for example, they sometimes have partial awards, sometimes awards, sometimes decisions. Some of those
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well, why haven't you referred to paragraph 322? The whole raison d'être of the narrative dispositif was to make sure that what the parties received from you was all-embracing, and that we wouldn't then be drawn into disputes about whether the short form actually incorporated the reasons. But we asked for it to avoid	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful mine to explore, particularly when it comes to claims commissions. Mr Chairman, you mentioned the Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission. And we're aware that, for example, they sometimes have partial awards, sometimes awards, sometimes decisions. Some of those decisions contain guidance which are much more
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well, why haven't you referred to paragraph 322? The whole raison d'être of the narrative dispositif was to make sure that what the parties received from you was all-embracing, and that we wouldn't then be drawn into disputes about whether the short form actually incorporated the reasons. But we asked for it to avoid uncertainty and as a belt and braces, out of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful mine to explore, particularly when it comes to claims commissions. Mr Chairman, you mentioned the Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission. And we're aware that, for example, they sometimes have partial awards, sometimes awards, sometimes decisions. Some of those decisions contain guidance which are much more elaborated as part of those decisions.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well, why haven't you referred to paragraph 322? The whole raison d'être of the narrative dispositif was to make sure that what the parties received from you was all-embracing, and that we wouldn't then be drawn into disputes about whether the short form actually incorporated the reasons. But we asked for it to avoid	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful mine to explore, particularly when it comes to claims commissions. Mr Chairman, you mentioned the Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission. And we're aware that, for example, they sometimes have partial awards, sometimes awards, sometimes decisions. Some of those decisions contain guidance which are much more
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	paragraphs, as you've heard. If, however, you include a short-form dispositif which then cross-refers to particular parts of the award, you may very well find that it generates a dispute as to why this paragraph was excluded rather than included. So if you think of that approach, it may be and this is a little bit, I think, what we were anticipating in the format of our final submissions if you think of this approach, it may be, for example, that you say something like, in the short-form part of the dispositif, that, "The interpretation of paragraph 8(d) will be as follows, as set out in section 5 of the award". So that it's not something which adopts an approach which says, "as set out in paragraphs 321 and 323", and then the question that arises is: well, why haven't you referred to paragraph 322? The whole raison d'être of the narrative dispositif was to make sure that what the parties received from you was all-embracing, and that we wouldn't then be drawn into disputes about whether the short form actually incorporated the reasons. But we asked for it to avoid uncertainty and as a belt and braces, out of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	a series of preliminary awards or interim awards or partial awards and final awards, each one building on the other. And some of them are avowedly addressing issues of law before the tribunal comes to the final determination on the facts. There are other examples that come to mind as well: North Sea Continental Shelf, two joined judgments of the International Court of Justice in 1969. This was a little bit more of a hybrid, because the court went into a little bit more of an elaboration of reasons, but the questions in dispute were rather narrower. So what you have in the dispositif is a paragraph rather than a sentence, but it just shows a little bit more of an elaboration. And then from our knowledge and research so far, it looks as if there is probably going to be a useful mine to explore, particularly when it comes to claims commissions. Mr Chairman, you mentioned the Ethiopia-Eritrea Claims Commission. And we're aware that, for example, they sometimes have partial awards, sometimes awards, sometimes decisions. Some of those decisions contain guidance which are much more elaborated as part of those decisions.

16:07 1	aware that there are lots of hybrid formats that could	16:10 1	follow up on the last point you had.
2		2	My reason in pointing to Article IX of the Treaty
3		3	was not particularly well-developed thinking. But what
4		4	I had in mind was that as we're thinking through the
5		5	fact that we've got a Neutral Expert as
6	_	6	a decision-maker, a Court of Arbitration as
7		7	a decision-maker, and we're thinking about res judicata
8		8	effects of those two dispute-settlers, their respective
9		9	competences obviously are different in scope. And it
10		10	
11		10	would view the competence of the Court of Arbitration as
12		12	_
13		13	
14		13	-
15		15	
16	-	16	
17		10	
18	-	18	-
19		19	· · · ·
20		20	
21		21	Neutral Expert or a Court of Arbitration.
22		22	_
23		23	
24		24	
25		25	proceeding, but is instead part and parcel of what the
	Page 201		Page 203
16.09 1	and the methods of the last He Claims	16.11 1	Tracto and stal the diameter antiland to de
16:08 1	across the spectrum. As I said, the Iran-US Claims	16:11 1	Treaty expected the dispute-settlers to do.
2	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently.	2	SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and
2 3	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced	2 3	SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration.
2 3 4	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was	2 3 4	SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course
2 3 4 5	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need	2 3 4 5	SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds)
2 3 4 5 6	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course	2 3 4 5 6	SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to
2 3 4 5 6 7	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend.	2 3 4 5 6 7	SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement. But those are issues that we can come back to. And, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in PO6, that having two mechanisms seised of a dispute
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement. But those are issues that we can come back to. And, Mr Chairman, if you've got any responses or reactions or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in PO6, that having two mechanisms seised of a dispute or aspects of a dispute in parallel is compatible
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement. But those are issues that we can come back to. And, Mr Chairman, if you've got any responses or reactions or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in PO6, that having two mechanisms seised of a dispute or aspects of a dispute in parallel is compatible with the Treaty, it's not evident that this was the best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement. But those are issues that we can come back to. And, Mr Chairman, if you've got any responses or reactions or further questions, obviously I'd be very happy to take them down, or you can include them in your questions to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in PO6, that having two mechanisms seised of a dispute or aspects of a dispute in parallel is compatible with the Treaty, it's not evident that this was the best way to proceed. And it may be that the unusual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement. But those are issues that we can come back to. And, Mr Chairman, if you've got any responses or reactions or further questions, obviously I'd be very happy to take them down, or you can include them in your questions to 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in PO6, that having two mechanisms seised of a dispute or aspects of a dispute in parallel is compatible with the Treaty, it's not evident that this was the best way to proceed. And it may be that the unusual circumstance of a Court handing off to a Neutral Expert,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement. But those are issues that we can come back to. And, Mr Chairman, if you've got any responses or reactions or further questions, obviously I'd be very happy to take them down, or you can include them in your questions to us of tomorrow.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in PO6, that having two mechanisms seised of a dispute or aspects of a dispute in parallel is compatible with the Treaty, it's not evident that this was the best way to proceed. And it may be that the unusual circumstance of a Court handing off to a Neutral Expert, handing back to a court, is something that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement. But those are issues that we can come back to. And, Mr Chairman, if you've got any responses or reactions or further questions, obviously I'd be very happy to take them down, or you can include them in your questions to us of tomorrow. (4.10 pm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in PO6, that having two mechanisms seised of a dispute or aspects of a dispute in parallel is compatible with the Treaty, it's not evident that this was the best way to proceed. And it may be that the unusual circumstance of a Court handing off to a Neutral Expert, handing back to a court, is something that is contemplated or workable under Article IX, but we'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement. But those are issues that we can come back to. And, Mr Chairman, if you've got any responses or reactions or further questions, obviously I'd be very happy to take them down, or you can include them in your questions to us of tomorrow. (4.10 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. Maybe I'll just	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in PO6, that having two mechanisms seised of a dispute or aspects of a dispute in parallel is compatible with the Treaty, it's not evident that this was the best way to proceed. And it may be that the unusual circumstance of a Court handing off to a Neutral Expert, handing back to a court, is something that is contemplated or workable under Article IX, but we'll have to give some thought as to whether it fits within this framework.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Tribunal will do this kind of thing very frequently. Then the last point, Mr Chairman, was you referenced Article IX of the Treaty. It wasn't a point that I was going to come to, and we can think about whether we need to address it or make anything more of it in the course of the weekend. Instinctively, that doesn't seem to me to fall quite within this kind of framework, because essentially what that is setting up are a number of gateways. Article IX(1) talks about "Any question [of] interpretation or application", but then there are a number of gateways. And I don't think that we are here quite talking about gateways to decision-making, but rather about how you capture your decision in a way which is binding and authoritative, and least amenable to dispute and disagreement. But those are issues that we can come back to. And, Mr Chairman, if you've got any responses or reactions or further questions, obviously I'd be very happy to take them down, or you can include them in your questions to us of tomorrow. (4.10 pm) 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you for that, for your thought, and we will give it additional consideration. Of course (Fire alarm sounds) THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately we will pause the proceeding to see if our Registrar can resolve the alarm situation. Perhaps we can stay here until we are told we need to leave. (Pause) It looks like our Registrar did resolve the situation. So, Sir Daniel, that was the only observation I had. Please feel free to proceed. SIR DANIEL: And just before the alarm went off, I was just going to say: thank you, Mr Chairman, for that. It's a helpful further thought to provoke our thinking. While you have found in your Competence Award, in PO6, that having two mechanisms seised of a dispute or aspects of a dispute in parallel is compatible with the Treaty, it's not evident that this was the best way to proceed. And it may be that the unusual circumstance of a Court handing off to a Neutral Expert, handing back to a court, is something that is contemplated or workable under Article IX, but we'll have to give some thought as to whether it fits within

		I	
16:14 1	It also takes us back to the question that you	16:17 1	subject to the winds of questions blowing me off course
	raised, Mr Chairman, about a paragraph 13 challenge:	2	subject to the winds of questions blowing me off-course. So my closing submissions are divided into four
2	would it have to go back to another Court, or could it	3	
3	-	4	parts.
4	conceivably come to this Court?		First of all, I would like to make some brief
5	So we will take it away and give that some further	5	observations on issues of substance.
6	thought.	6	Second, I will turn to some framing considerations
7	THE CHAIRMAN: Just to be clear, I was not contemplating	7	for your task in this first phase on the merits. And in
8	a passing-back to a Neutral Expert. I was really just	8	particular, I'd like to make reference to the Competence
9	contemplating that you have a circle in which the	9	Award and PO6.
10	Neutral Expert can operate; you have then a broader	10	Third, I'd like to address what is to be addressed,
11	circle within which a Court of Arbitration can operate.	11	in what form and when. And that will pick up a little
12	It seems to me it would be a natural thing for	12	bit on Professor Tanzi's submissions.
13	a Court of Arbitration to receive questions that fall	13	Then finally, what I'd like to do, very briefly, is
14	both inside and outside the scope of what a Neutral	14	just to walk through our final submissions, and I will
15	Expert could do, to first be deciding the broader	15	ask my colleagues to put those on screen and that's
16	questions that are necessary before you can get to those	16	at Memorial paragraphs 13.29 and 13.30 just to make
17	more plant-specific questions, and then decide the	17	a number of more focused observations and to draw these
18	plant-specific questions.	18	to your attention. But our final submissions will be
19	In other words, the way that Article IX is	19	made more formally on Tuesday afternoon, when we close
20	structured seems to me to contemplate this possibility	20	our case.
21	of threshold broader questions, to be followed by	21	Beyond that, Mr Chairman, there will be some
22	plant-specific questions; and that it could all stay	22	housekeeping issues to be addressed which are relevant
23	within the scope of that one Court of Arbitration, but	23	to the second round. But I'll come to those, if you
24	it could also be sequenced in terms of an initial award	24	don't already have those in mind, as I imagine you do.
25	and then a follow-on award.	25	Before I embark on these four stages, let me just
	Page 205		Page 207
16:15 1	That was all I was trying to think through	16.19 1	make two proliminary observations. The first one is to
16:15 1	That was all I was trying to think through.	16:18 1	make two preliminary observations. The first one is to
2	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must	2	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to
2 3	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples,	2 3	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention.
2 3 4	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way,	2 3 4	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been
2 3 4 5	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to	2 3 4 5	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've
2 3 4 5 6	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address	2 3 4 5 6	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the
2 3 4 5 6 7	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing	2 3 4 5 6 7	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing with it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the Court and Dr Miles on the issue of pondage. And that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing with it. But we'll come back and give that some further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the Court and Dr Miles on the issue of pondage. And that is that the interpretation of the Treaty is, of course,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing with it. But we'll come back and give that some further thought.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the Court and Dr Miles on the issue of pondage. And that is that the interpretation of the Treaty is, of course, going to be informed, and heavily informed, and properly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing with it. But we'll come back and give that some further thought. (4.16 pm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the Court and Dr Miles on the issue of pondage. And that is that the interpretation of the Treaty is, of course, going to be informed, and heavily informed, and properly heavily informed, by engineering appreciations, but this
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing with it. But we'll come back and give that some further thought.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the Court and Dr Miles on the issue of pondage. And that is that the interpretation of the Treaty is, of course, going to be informed, and heavily informed, and properly
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing with it. But we'll come back and give that some further thought. (4.16 pm) Concluding observations and request for relief 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the Court and Dr Miles on the issue of pondage. And that is that the interpretation of the Treaty is, of course, going to be informed, and heavily informed, and properly heavily informed, by engineering appreciations, but this is ultimately a legal text that's going to have to be
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing with it. But we'll come back and give that some further thought. (4.16 pm) Concluding observations and request for relief SIR DANIEL: So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the Court and Dr Miles on the issue of pondage. And that is that the interpretation of the Treaty is, of course, going to be informed, and heavily informed, and properly heavily informed, by engineering appreciations, but this is ultimately a legal text that's going to have to be interpreted for what it is, because this is the only
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing with it. But we'll come back and give that some further thought. (4.16 pm) Concluding observations and request for relief SIR DANIEL: So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that takes me to my hastily scribbled but nonetheless 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the Court and Dr Miles on the issue of pondage. And that is that the interpretation of the Treaty is, of course, going to be informed, and heavily informed, and properly heavily informed, by engineering appreciations, but this is ultimately a legal text that's going to have to be interpreted for what it is, because this is the only thing that is certain between the parties.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And that must obviously be correct, because there are many examples, including in the Great Hall of Justice across the way, in which the ICJ has decided to sequence something: to the parties, a direction, "Could you please address this, and then we'll come and address the next thing later". And I do recall that one of the submissions that we have made to you about competence, when we were still in the halcyon days of thinking about coordination, I think I recall standing here and handing up that A3 coordination document to you in the very first meeting, and characterising it in terms of: let's deal with the interpretation first, and let's deal with the application second. So that may be a way of dealing with it. But we'll come back and give that some further thought. (4.16 pm) Concluding observations and request for relief SIR DANIEL: So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that takes me to my hastily scribbled but nonetheless typed-up remarks for closing. And as I say, I will cut 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	draw attention to chapter 13 of our Memorial and to commend it for your very close attention. Now, we, on our side of the podium, have been sitting with rapt attention and enthusiasm as you've taken us to the footnotes and the annexes and the appendices, so we imagine that you've actually gone through chapter 13 in close detail. But in case not, we do commend it to your attention. And I will be picking up themes from that chapter, and there will be a detailed elaboration of the final submissions in due course. The second preliminary observation is really to pick up on a theme that I think has been developing during the course of the week, but I think most evident, perhaps, in the context of the exchanges between the Court and Dr Miles on the issue of pondage. And that is that the interpretation of the Treaty is, of course, going to be informed, and heavily informed, and properly heavily informed, by engineering appreciations, but this is ultimately a legal text that's going to have to be interpreted for what it is, because this is the only thing that is certain between the parties. Dr Morris, when he donned his hat as a lawyer at the

16:20	1	read the travaux préparatoires some years ago, no doubt	16:22 1	that I think would be useful to draw together as we
10.20	2	in the context of the Kishenganga case, his impression,	2	conclude.
	3	as an engineer reading the travaux, was that there was	3	The first one is the framing issue of Article III
	4	not a great deal of meeting of the minds on really	4	and Annexure D.
	5	detailed issues at the time of the negotiations, and	5	As I have listened both to our submissions and to
	6	that the party were cajoled, pressured, influenced by	6	the Court's enquiry over the course of the last week,
	7	the World Bank to reach agreement.	7	I have to say I've been wondering whether we have
	8	And the text of the Treaty that we have is the only	8	been through perhaps dint of circumstance, because
	9	agreement that we have by the parties: that's the text	9	we are so buried deep in these issues that perhaps
	10	to which they all put their signatures, even if that is	10	we've been shining a light on issues less clearly or too
	11	masked by disagreement. So the text is what we are left	11	sharply on some issues. So I'm going to try just to
	12	with: this text of this, as it were, constitutional	12	draw back a little bit and shine a spotlight on
	13	instrument between the two states. So we've got a very	13	particular rocks in the navigation channel which may
	14	interesting and important interplay between the	14	want steering around.
	15	engineering appreciations and the legal appreciations	15	The first one is this framework of Article III and
	16	which are going to be necessary here.	16	then of Annexure D.
	17	To some extent and I have to say, we are not	17	I think the starting point is that Pakistan has
	18	terribly clear on this ourselves but to some extent,	18	a right of unrestricted use to the waters of the Western
	19	this may have been the approach that was intended in the	19	Rivers. The starting point is not let flow. Let flow
	20	differentiation of the mechanisms between the Neutral	20	is the obligation which is the corollary of the right.
	21	Expert process and the Court process: the Neutral Expert	21	The starting point is the right of unrestricted use. We
	22	process, which is a process which is just left to	22	then have the corollary, which is India's obligation to
	23	engineering interpretation, but a much narrower process;	23	let flow, not to interfere, and no storage.
	24	and the Court process, which is a process of legal	24	I think we've perhaps all been a little bit
	25	systemic interpretation, which is informed by	25	bedazzled or confused or seduced by the concept of
		Page 209		Page 211
		1 age 207		1 age 211
16:21	1	engineering appreciations.	16:24 1	let flow because it is such an unusual concept, to think
16:21	1 2	engineering appreciations. Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in	16:24 1 2	let flow because it is such an unusual concept, to think of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's
16:21				-
16:21	2	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in	2	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's
16:21	2 3	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the	2 3	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that
16:21	2 3 4	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the	2 3 4	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use.
16:21	2 3 4 5	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come	2 3 4 5	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then
16:21	2 3 4 5 6	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume	2 3 4 5 6	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no
16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed	2 3 4 5 6 7	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and repackage the argument of substance that we've heard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate hydropower however it wishes.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and repackage the argument of substance that we've heard over the course of the last week. I've tried to do so	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate hydropower however it wishes. That's what the Treaty provides. It doesn't say,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and repackage the argument of substance that we've heard over the course of the last week. I've tried to do so a little bit as we've gone along, and if I try and do so	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate hydropower however it wishes. That's what the Treaty provides. It doesn't say, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and repackage the argument of substance that we've heard over the course of the last week. I've tried to do so a little bit as we've gone along, and if I try and do so now, I'm both going to run out of time and get them all	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate hydropower however it wishes. That's what the Treaty provides. It doesn't say, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower. It says, Article III(2)(d), that India is
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and repackage the argument of substance that we've heard over the course of the last week. I've tried to do so a little bit as we've gone along, and if I try and do so now, I'm both going to run out of time and get them all confused. But we will try and pick up some of the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate hydropower however it wishes. That's what the Treaty provides. It doesn't say, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower. It says, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower in accordance with
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and repackage the argument of substance that we've heard over the course of the last week. I've tried to do so a little bit as we've gone along, and if I try and do so now, I'm both going to run out of time and get them all confused. But we will try and pick up some of the themes again next week.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate hydropower however it wishes. That's what the Treaty provides. It doesn't say, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower. It says, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower in accordance with Annexure D, and Annexure D is a tight constraint on how
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and repackage the argument of substance that we've heard over the course of the last week. I've tried to do so a little bit as we've gone along, and if I try and do so now, I'm both going to run out of time and get them all confused. But we will try and pick up some of the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate hydropower however it wishes. That's what the Treaty provides. It doesn't say, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower. It says, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower in accordance with
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and repackage the argument of substance that we've heard over the course of the last week. I've tried to do so a little bit as we've gone along, and if I try and do so now, I'm both going to run out of time and get them all confused. But we will try and pick up some of the themes again next week.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. So we have the right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate hydropower however it wishes. That's what the Treaty provides. It doesn't say, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower. It says, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower in accordance with Annexure D, and Annexure D is a tight constraint on how
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Of course, that's one of the reasons why, in Annexure G, it is provided that at least one of the members of the Court should be an engineer, so that the engineering and the legal appreciations could come together; and there will be at least or we assume at least one of the members of the Court who would be a lawyer. It might have been that the appointing authority from Imperial College might have appointed a lawyer and the appointing authority from the US Supreme Court might have appointed an engineer, but that would have been a slightly unusual outcome. So it's just to say that we are going to have to find a way to bring the engineering appreciations and legal appreciations together. With that, I turn to my first substantive topic, which is some brief observations on points of substance. And I don't, in this context, propose to review and repackage the argument of substance that we've heard over the course of the last week. I've tried to do so a little bit as we've gone along, and if I try and do so now, I'm both going to run out of time and get them all confused. But we will try and pick up some of the themes again next week.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	of this in terms of a let-flow obligation. It's a let-flow obligation, but it's an obligation that arises under Pakistan's right of unrestricted use. We then have India's corollary obligations: let flow, no interference and no storage. And then we have, underneath that, India's entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. So right, obligation, entitlement by way of exception to generate hydroelectric power. And then we have the exercise of the exception, which is not unrestricted; it is subject to tight constraint. That's in Annexure D. And there is, I think, a critically important point, which I also have a sense perhaps in the cut-and-thrust of looking at some of the entrails of the questions that we may be losing sight of, and that is that India is not free to generate hydropower however it wishes. That's what the Treaty provides. It doesn't say, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower. It says, Article III(2)(d), that India is entitled to generate hydropower in accordance with Annexure D, and Annexure D is a tight constraint on how they are able to do so. So it's not a self-standing

16:25 1	free entitlement to exercise an exceptional right.	16:28 1	I'm not here talking about the grand bargains that I've
2	In this context, I suspect as well because we	2	addressed you on, but I'll come back to those in just
3	have been so focused, at least on our side, and we may	3	a moment.
4	therefore have lost sight of the wood for the trees	4	But it's useful, I think, and necessary for purposes
5	we have perhaps lost a little bit of sight of what is	5	of your deliberations and the conclusion that you will
6	an absolutely critical and fundamental concept when	6	come to, to remember that this is not a one-sided
7	we come to dealing with unrestricted use, and that is	7	bargain. India got control and exclusivity over the
8	the principle of non-interference.	8	Eastern Rivers, subject to very, very, very tight
8 9	Because the principle of non-interference, and how	8 9	limitations for Pakistan. And it's important that the
10			Court does not lose sight of this. This is not simply
	it is precisely defined in Article I, paragraph (15), is a very important indicator of the balance that was	10	a bargain about how Pakistan has a right of unrestricted
11 12	struck in the Treaty. We've had a lot of submissions to	11 12	use, and what is the extent of India's exceptional
12		12	entitlement to hydropower.
13	you, but also a lot of questions from you to us, about precisely what this balance is.	13	This is why we've been so concerned to talk to you
	In a sense, the balance is to be found, in some		
15 16	shape or form, in this term "interference with the	15	about the layering of the bargains. We've got the peace
		16	bargain, which settled the peace. We've got the Treaty
17	waters of", and the prohibition of interference, subject	17	bargain, which is the balance between the parties
18	to exception in Article III, paragraph (2). And if	18	between Article II and Article III. India got the use
19 20	I can just recall briefly and this does not need to	19 20	of the Eastern Rivers; Pakistan got the use of the Western Rivers. And it's only within Pakistan's side of
	come up on the screen and you don't need to have a look		-
21 22	at it because we've looked at it already. But I(15)	21 22	the bargain that this dispute is arising. So what we have at the moment, in Pakistan's
22	says: "The term 'interference with the waters' means:		
23 24	(a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or"	23 24	submission, is a circumstance in which India, through the stopping of the waters of the Eastern Rivers, wants
24 25	And we're more concerned with paragraph (b):	24 25	to bank its side of the bargain, and then have
23	And we te more concerned with paragraph (0).	25	to bank its side of the bargani, and then have
	Page 213		Page 215
16:27 1	"Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes	16:30 1	an argument on Pakistan's side of the bargain about how
16:27 1 2	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the	16:30 1 2	much it can get from us.
	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters"		much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro
2 3 4	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale.	2 3 4	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates
2 3	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is	2 3 4 5	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the
2 3 4 5 6	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And	2 3 4 5 6	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates
2 3 4 5 6 7	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that	2 3 4 5 6 7	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the corollary obligations of let flow, no interference and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and others have said, this is something which was driving
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the corollary obligations of let flow, no interference and no storage; and then the entitlement by way of exception	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and others have said, this is something which was driving the negotiations that took place in the 1950s up to
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the corollary obligations of let flow, no interference and no storage; and then the entitlement by way of exception to hydropower; but a tightly constrained exception.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and others have said, this is something which was driving the negotiations that took place in the 1950s up to 1960. It's a returning concern on the part of Pakistan.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the corollary obligations of let flow, no interference and no storage; and then the entillement by way of exception to hydropower; but a tightly constrained exception. I think at this point it's also perhaps useful for	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and others have said, this is something which was driving the negotiations that took place in the 1950s up to 1960. It's a returning concern on the part of Pakistan. It is a speculative concern, but it is one that's
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the corollary obligations of let flow, no interference and no storage; and then the entitlement by way of exception to hydropower; but a tightly constrained exception. I think at this point it's also perhaps useful for me to remind us all and again, it's inevitable when	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and others have said, this is something which was driving the negotiations that took place in the 1950s up to 1960. It's a returning concern on the part of Pakistan. It is a speculative concern, but it is one that's important. We need to understand it, and we need to
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the corollary obligations of let flow, no interference and no storage; and then the entitlement by way of exception to hydropower; but a tightly constrained exception. I think at this point it's also perhaps useful for me to remind us all and again, it's inevitable when one gets drawn into the detail of the examination of the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and others have said, this is something which was driving the negotiations that took place in the 1950s up to 1960. It's a returning concern on the part of Pakistan. It is a speculative concern, but it is one that's important. We need to understand it, and we need to understand its role to play, and not to make it the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the corollary obligations of let flow, no interference and no storage; and then the entitlement by way of exception to hydropower; but a tightly constrained exception. I think at this point it's also perhaps useful for me to remind us all and again, it's inevitable when one gets drawn into the detail of the examination of the small aspects of paragraph 8, what does this provision	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and others have said, this is something which was driving the negotiations that took place in the 1950s up to 1960. It's a returning concern on the part of Pakistan. It is a speculative concern, but it is one that's important. We need to understand it, and we need to understand its role to play, and not to make it the elephant in the room that is driving everything.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the corollary obligations of let flow, no interference and no storage; and then the entitlement by way of exception to hydropower; but a tightly constrained exception. I think at this point it's also perhaps useful for me to remind us all and again, it's inevitable when one gets drawn into the detail of the examination of the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and others have said, this is something which was driving the negotiations that took place in the 1950s up to 1960. It's a returning concern on the part of Pakistan. It is a speculative concern, but it is one that's important. We need to understand it, and we need to understand its role to play, and not to make it the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Now, that's a pretty dramatic balancing scale. Because what we have in Article III, paragraph 2 is "thou shalt not interfere", subject to exception. And the principle of non-interference says that "interference" means: "Any man-made obstruction" a dam "which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters". A dam is going to do that, unless you just build the structure and let the water flow through. So it may be that when you come to think of this balance, that it's going to be useful for you to think about it with perhaps a little bit more granular focus on the principle of non-interference, and in the way that I've just described: unrestricted use; the corollary obligations of let flow, no interference and no storage; and then the entitlement by way of exception to hydropower; but a tightly constrained exception. I think at this point it's also perhaps useful for me to remind us all and again, it's inevitable when one gets drawn into the detail of the examination of the small aspects of paragraph 8, what does this provision	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	much it can get from us. And you need to draw back and say, "This hydro bargain does not operate in isolation: it operates within the framework of the Treaty bargain, which is the Article II, Article III; and the Treaty bargain operates within the framework of the peace bargain". Because the peace bargain is essential when it comes to determining exactly where that balance should lie. And I suspect a little bit that in the context of focusing on the entrails of particular provisions, that there is a risk that we may have lost a little bit of sight of that. This brings me to the issue of weaponisation, about which we've heard a lot: both to identify its importance and the role that it has to play, but also to ensure that it is not blown out of all proportion. Because as Dr Morris and as Mr Akbar and as I and Ms Rees-Evans and others have said, this is something which was driving the negotiations that took place in the 1950s up to 1960. It's a returning concern on the part of Pakistan. It is a speculative concern, but it is one that's important. We need to understand it, and we need to understand its role to play, and not to make it the elephant in the room that is driving everything.

1601 1		16.05 1	
16:31 1	forefronts of the minds of the negotiators and it	16:35 1	respective rights and duties as reflected in the Treaty
2	remains a core concern. You heard the travaux	2	as a whole, the three bargains. And the balance is
3	circumstances dimension from Ms Rees-Evans and you've	3	between Pakistan's right under the primary rule and
4	heard the real ongoing concerns that we've all	4	India's entitlement under the exception.
5	expressed. And this is relevant to an understanding of	5	India's approach, we say, would turn that enquiry on
6	the balance that was struck in 1960.	6	its head, because it would be saying, "How much can we
7	Ms Rees-Evans took you to an exhibit,	7	get by way of the exception? And then let's see what
8	Exhibit P-0515, in which Mr Iliff, the World Bank's	8	damage we do to the rule". You have to come to this
9	chief negotiator, wrote at the time about Annexure D	9	through the rule, and then come to the exception.
10	that its provisions "certainly tie India up very	10	So relevant to the principle and you've heard
11	tightly". There was an understanding on the part of	11	Professor Webb, you've heard me, you've heard others on
12	everyone in the room, when the Treaty was signed in	12	this ad nauseam, so I won't go into it in any detail at
13	1960, that the intent and the purpose and the effect of	13	all but relevant to the principle is that the
14	Annexure D was to "tie India up very tightly".	14	exception must be interpreted narrowly so as not to
15	It is not the task of dispute settlement, I would	15	diminish the headline rule.
16	say respectfully, it's not the task of dispute	16	Again, we say all three of the bargains the peace
17	settlement to prise open Annexure D and say, "We need to	17	bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain are
18	give India a little bit more water than it was entitled	18	all not only relevant to the interpretation but they are
19	in 1960", or "We need to view the bargain a little bit	19	absolutely necessary and mandated for you in your task.
20	more narrowly". We need to view the Treaty for what the	20	Because this is the essence of the general rule of
21	Treaty is and was, which is a peace bargain, a treaty	21	treaty interpretation and the supplementary rules: that
22	bargain and Article II, Article III [bargain] and	22	you look not just at the words on the page, but you look
23	then the hydro bargain, which proceeds on the basis of	23	at their wider context, you look at good faith and
24	a right, obligations which are corollaries of the right,	24	good faith brings this all in and you look at the
25	and then narrowly constrained exceptions.	25	object and purpose of the Treaty, quite apart from the
	Page 217		Page 219
	rage 217		rage 219
16:33 1	So, Mr Minear, to your question about how to balance	16:36 1	circumstances of conclusion and the
2	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with	2	travaux préparatoires.
2 3	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower	2 3	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of
2 3 4	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert,	2 3 4	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of
2 3 4 5	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well;	2 3 4 5	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate
2 3 4 5 6	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the	2 3 4 5 6	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question.	2 3 4 5 6 7	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our territory and saying, "We want more from you".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty. India cannot come along to us and say, "We plan to site a hydroelectric plant here. We are going to build
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our territory and saying, "We want more from you". And we think that the task of the Court and it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty. India cannot come along to us and say, "We plan to site a hydroelectric plant here. We are going to build it with 1960s technology, and because of that, we are
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our territory and saying, "We want more from you". And we think that the task of the Court and it comes back to paragraph 29 of Annexure G as well that	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty. India cannot come along to us and say, "We plan to site a hydroelectric plant here. We are going to build it with 1960s technology, and because of that, we are required to flush, we are required to do all sorts of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our territory and saying, "We want more from you". And we think that the task of the Court and it comes back to paragraph 29 of Annexure G as well that the task of the Court is to identify and determine and	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty. India cannot come along to us and say, "We plan to site a hydroelectric plant here. We are going to build it with 1960s technology, and because of that, we are required to flush, we are required to do all sorts of other things". Our response is going to be: no, "sound
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our territory and saying, "We want more from you". And we think that the task of the Court and it comes back to paragraph 29 of Annexure G as well that the task of the Court is to identify and determine and specify what the balance was that was struck at the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty. India cannot come along to us and say, "We plan to site a hydroelectric plant here. We are going to build it with 1960s technology, and because of that, we are required to flush, we are required to do all sorts of other things". Our response is going to be: no, "sound and economic design" requires sound and economic design
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our territory and saying, "We want more from you". And we think that the task of the Court and it comes back to paragraph 29 of Annexure G as well that the task of the Court is to identify and determine and specify what the balance was that was struck at the time, not to enlarge it with a view only on the hydro	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty. India cannot come along to us and say, "We plan to site a hydroelectric plant here. We are going to build it with 1960s technology, and because of that, we are required to flush, we are required to do all sorts of other things". Our response is going to be: no, "sound and economic design" requires sound and economic design
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our territory and saying, "We want more from you". And we think that the task of the Court and it comes back to paragraph 29 of Annexure G as well that the task of the Court is to identify and determine and specify what the balance was that was struck at the time, not to enlarge it with a view only on the hydro bargain, without the view of the Treaty bargain and the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty. India cannot come along to us and say, "We plan to site a hydroelectric plant here. We are going to build it with 1960s technology, and because of that, we are required to flush, we are required to do all sorts of other things". Our response is going to be: no, "sound and economic design" requires sound and economic design today. And if it's going to cost you a little bit more to comply with your Treaty obligations because you site
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our territory and saying, "We want more from you". And we think that the task of the Court and it comes back to paragraph 29 of Annexure G as well that the task of the Court is to identify and determine and specify what the balance was that was struck at the time, not to enlarge it with a view only on the hydro	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty. India cannot come along to us and say, "We plan to site a hydroelectric plant here. We are going to build it with 1960s technology, and because of that, we are required to flush, we are required to do all sorts of other things". Our response is going to be: no, "sound and economic design" requires sound and economic design today. And if it's going to cost you a little bit more
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation with India's entitlement to enough water for hydropower generation and it may also be, Professor Buytaert, that it's something that you asked about as well; forgive me if my mind is a little bit unclear on the provenance of the question. But let me just say that I think Pakistan's response is that we don't think that that is the balance that needs to be accommodated, between Pakistan's speculative concern about weaponisation and India's entitlement to enough water to generate hydropower. The balance to be struck is a much deeper, much more nuanced and much wider-spread balance: it's the balance of the Treaty. Because as I say, what we find at the moment is India cutting off the waters of the Eastern Rivers, trying to bank its side of the bargain, then coming to play in our territory and saying, "We want more from you". And we think that the task of the Court and it comes back to paragraph 29 of Annexure G as well that the task of the Court is to identify and determine and specify what the balance was that was struck at the time, not to enlarge it with a view only on the hydro bargain, without the view of the Treaty bargain and the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 travaux préparatoires. Now, as a next point, I'd say that the terms of Annexure D allow for, and warrant, consideration of changing technologies, including for reasons of climate change, to be taken into account. You've heard a number of examples of how technology may be relevant for India when it comes to addressing its obligations under the Treaty. One such example emerges because of advances in tunnelling technologies, that Dr Morris spoke about. He also spoke about innovations in the hydraulics when it comes to outlets, and there's also the issue of the coating of turbines. So there are lots of innovations in technology that we say not just are permitted by the Treaty; we say they are actually required by the Treaty. India cannot come along to us and say, "We plan to site a hydroelectric plant here. We are going to build it with 1960s technology, and because of that, we are required to flush, we are required to do all sorts of other things". Our response is going to be: no, "sound and economic design" requires sound and economic design today. And if it's going to cost you a little bit more to comply with your Treaty obligations because you site

16:38 1	build desanders, or that you spend an extra amount every	16:41 1	projects under Annexure E, instead of run-of-river HEPs
2	year or every five years or every ten years on coating	2	under Annexure D. And you've heard already, I think,
3	your turbines, or if you acquire the latest hydraulics	3	from Dr Morris and from others, that there is something
4	when it comes to outlets, that is what you have to do.	4	that is not congruent with the Treaty when one has this
5	You are not building your plants on the Western Rivers	5	appreciation. And this is a feature of the Baglihar
6	in the same way as you're building your plants in the	6	approach to the calculation of pondage.
7	east of the country, where you have a much wider	7	India can build efficient HEPs on the Western
8	entitlement.	8	Rivers, sound of design and satisfactory and economical
9	This brings me to a point that I hope has come	9	in their workings, in compliance with the Treaty. There
10	through to you through all of our submissions.	10	are always workarounds. You've heard this from
10	India is designing its Western run-of-river plants	10	Dr Morris. The design criteria of the Treaty do not
11	for the 5,000, not for the 201. And it's doing so on	12	preclude sound and economical design of Western
12	the basis of generic countrywide standards that it	12	run-of-river HEPs. And just to identify a number of key
13	wishes to apply to the 5,000; and the 201 are	13	considerations.
15	an irritant. Why does the CWC, the Central Water	15	Compliance with the Treaty. When India comes to
15	Commission authority in India "Why", they may be	15	plan its Western run-of-river HEPs, it must have in mind
10	saying to themselves, "Why do we have to go and take our	10	the importance of complying with the Treaty. The
18	well-developed, well-tried-and-tested standards off the	18	ability to comply with the Treaty is critical. It must
10	shelf, dust them down and see what changes we have to	10	take compliance into account from the very conception of
20	make for the 201 plants that we are planning on the	20	the HEP. It cannot simply be shaped by compliance only
20	Western Rivers?"	20	with Indian national standards, which may not be
21	And our response is: India, you entered into	21	Treaty-compliant.
22	an arrangement with Pakistan in 1960 to resolve	22	Second, to return to a point that I made and that
23	differences and look to the future. You bound yourself.	23	others have addressed as well, site choice is crucial.
24	In binding yourself, you had a reciprocal commitment	25	A small number of sites may be per se excluded because
25	in ondarig yoursen, you had a recipiotal communent	25	A small humber of sites may be per se excluded because
	Page 221		Page 223
16:40 1	from Pakistan, which also bound itself, to some benefit	16:43 1	they would only work with drawdown flushing.
16:40 1 2	from Pakistan, which also bound itself, to some benefit to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan.	16:43 1 2	they would only work with drawdown flushing. The example given by Professor Webb, the example
2	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan.	2	The example given by Professor Webb, the example
2 3	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility	2 3	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two
2 3 4	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms	2 3 4	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be
2 3 4 5	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite	2 3 4 5	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and
2 3 4 5 6	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must	2 3 4 5 6	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little
2 3 4 5 6 7	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that	2 3 4 5 6 7	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions. I come back to a point that I made in opening. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's evidence to you and your examination of him, is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions. I come back to a point that I made in opening. And it may have seemed like something that trips off the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's evidence to you and your examination of him, is that India is not as forthcoming with the information that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions. I come back to a point that I made in opening. And it may have seemed like something that trips off the tongue lightly, but it's not. India cannot strengthen 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's evidence to you and your examination of him, is that India is not as forthcoming with the information that it should be providing as the Treaty requires, and as
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions. I come back to a point that I made in opening. And it may have seemed like something that trips off the tongue lightly, but it's not. India cannot strengthen its weak case by the device of not coming here to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's evidence to you and your examination of him, is that India is not as forthcoming with the information that it should be providing as the Treaty requires, and as we would hope.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions. I come back to a point that I made in opening. And it may have seemed like something that trips off the tongue lightly, but it's not. India cannot strengthen its weak case by the device of not coming here to present it. And it raises a very significant issue 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's evidence to you and your examination of him, is that India is not as forthcoming with the information that it should be providing as the Treaty requires, and as we would hope. Professor Buytaert, I think you asked Dr Miles about
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions. I come back to a point that I made in opening. And it may have seemed like something that trips off the tongue lightly, but it's not. India cannot strengthen its weak case by the device of not coming here to present it. And it raises a very significant issue which I'll come back to in just a moment. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's evidence to you and your examination of him, is that India is not as forthcoming with the information that it should be providing as the Treaty requires, and as we would hope. Professor Buytaert, I think you asked Dr Miles about the provision of information relating to the load curve,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions. I come back to a point that I made in opening. And it may have seemed like something that trips off the tongue lightly, but it's not. India cannot strengthen its weak case by the device of not coming here to present it. And it raises a very significant issue which I'll come back to in just a moment. It is significant that India's run-of-river HEPs are	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's evidence to you and your examination of him, is that India is not as forthcoming with the information that it should be providing as the Treaty requires, and as we would hope. Professor Buytaert, I think you asked Dr Miles about the provision of information relating to the load curve, for example, and you took him back to the 1992 letter,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions. I come back to a point that I made in opening. And it may have seemed like something that trips off the tongue lightly, but it's not. India cannot strengthen its weak case by the device of not coming here to present it. And it raises a very significant issue which I'll come back to in just a moment. It is significant that India's run-of-river HEPs are storing, in some instances, water by way of pondage as	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's evidence to you and your examination of him, is that India is not as forthcoming with the information that it should be providing as the Treaty requires, and as we would hope. Professor Buytaert, I think you asked Dr Miles about the provision of information relating to the load curve, for example, and you took him back to the 1992 letter, which was the beginning of the Baglihar dispute.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	to Pakistan but also to some detriment to Pakistan. That bargain has to hold. And it is the responsibility of the Treaty, and the dispute settlement mechanisms under the Treaty, to hold India to that bargain, despite the fact of its absence from the Court. India must design its plants from the get-go, from the minute that they come into the minds of the planners, with the Treaty in mind. Now India's case on the issues engaged by this phase of proceedings can be found in its pleadings in the Baglihar case, its pleadings in the Kishenganga case, its engagements in the Permanent Indus Commission, its public statements, in its correspondence. And Pakistan has set out carefully its appreciation of India's case throughout its submissions. I come back to a point that I made in opening. And it may have seemed like something that trips off the tongue lightly, but it's not. India cannot strengthen its weak case by the device of not coming here to present it. And it raises a very significant issue which I'll come back to in just a moment. It is significant that India's run-of-river HEPs are	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	The example given by Professor Webb, the example that I've just touched upon now, is if there are two sites along the same stretch of river, one which may be a little more accessible and a little bit cheaper, and the other one which, notwithstanding that it's a little bit more accessible, may allow desanders to be built, then when India decides on the site, it's got to decide on the basis of what will be Treaty-compliant. It may be that there is marginally greater cost, but that greater cost will come at the benefit of compliance with the Treaty. Now the issue of choice of site of course usually happens before any engagement with Pakistan. And one of the difficulties, the challenges for Pakistan, that emerged, I think, most clearly from the Commissioner's evidence to you and your examination of him, is that India is not as forthcoming with the information that it should be providing as the Treaty requires, and as we would hope. Professor Buytaert, I think you asked Dr Miles about the provision of information relating to the load curve, for example, and you took him back to the 1992 letter,

16:44 1	stand here and correct myself on Monday or Tuesday,	16:47 1	other comments. I think you will see in the context of
2	whenever it is. But I think one of the problems since	2	both the Baglihar and certainly the Kishenganga dispute
3	1992 is that as the disputes have progressed and as	3	that the initial concerns about Kishenganga in 1988 were
4	these issues have remained unresolved, India is in fact	4	first picked up from press reports. And again, if I'm
5	withholding information or not providing it in a timely	5	misspeaking, I will correct myself on that, India is not
6	manner, and Pakistan is not able to engage in a fulsome	6	complying with its information-sharing obligations under
7	way.	7	the Treaty, and that is a precursor to the compliance
8	Paragraph 9 of Annexure D requires that the full	8	with the design criteria in paragraph 8.
9	design information has to be provided no less than	9	So I come back again to a point that I've touched
10	six months before, effectively, ground is broken. But	10	upon already, but just do so briefly.
11	the Commissioner also took you to and I think so did	11	Innovation in hydropower engineering, including as
12	Professor Webb, and I've done so as well also took	12	regards sediment management, are permitted and are
13	you to Article VII, paragraph (2) of the Treaty, which	13	required under the Treaty. And this includes the
14	addresses future cooperation. Again, I don't invite you	14	availability of state-of-the-art tunnelling
15	to turn it up, but I want to just reads the words, so	15	technologies, turbine coatings, hydraulic improvements
16 17	that it's clear what they say. And VII(2) says:	16	of intake designs. These are entirely compatible with
17	"If either Party plans to construct any engineering work which would cause interference with the waters"	17	the Treaty framework, and are called for by reference to $(1 - 1)^{1/2} = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1$
18		18 19	the language in 8(d), (e) and (f) of "sound and
19 20	Again, we come to "interference with the waters":		economical design". Every project has its own challenges. You've heard
20 21	"If either Party plans to construct any engineering work which would cause interference with the waters of	20 21	this from Dr Morris; and I imagine that Dr Blackmore,
21		21	when it comes to your deliberations in private away from
22	any of the Rivers which, in its opinion, would affect the other Party materially"	22	us, will be able to inform you of all of his experiences
23 24	And I should just interpolate here and say:	23 24	when it comes to dam design construction and operation.
24 25	"which would affect the other Party materially [in	24 25	Every project has its own challenges: geology,
23	which would affect the other Party materiary [m	25	Every project has its own chanenges. geology,
	Page 225		Page 227
16.46 1	its opinion]" that obviously has to be a good faith	16.40 1	topography, hydrology, community and environment
16:46 1 2	its opinion]", that obviously has to be a good faith interpretation because the siting of a HEP would	16:49 1 2	topography, hydrology, community and environment,
2	interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would	2	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions,
2 3	interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So	2 3	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather
2 3 4	interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not	2 3 4	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works
2 3 4 5	interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially	2 3 4 5	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing.
2 3 4 5 6	interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be	2 3 4 5 6	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016,
2 3 4 5 6 7	interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical.	2 3 4 5	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work	2 3 4 5 6 7	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration
2 3 4 5 6 7	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of a HEP, it needs to come along to Pakistan in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of Arbitration indeed that's going to turn around to India
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of a HEP, it needs to come along to Pakistan in the Commission that's the purpose of the Commission: it's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of Arbitration indeed that's going to turn around to India and say, "Tear down this dam".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of a HEP, it needs to come along to Pakistan in the Commission that's the purpose of the Commission: it's a standing body precisely for these purposes and say, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of Arbitration indeed that's going to turn around to India and say, "Tear down this dam". So the design criteria are Pakistan's only
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of a HEP, it needs to come along to Pakistan in the Commission that's the purpose of the Commission: it's a standing body precisely for these purposes and say, "We're thinking of siting the HEP over here. Let's have 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of Arbitration indeed that's going to turn around to India and say, "Tear down this dam". So the design criteria are Pakistan's only protection. They have to be got right from the outset,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of a HEP, it needs to come along to Pakistan in the Commission that's the purpose of the Commission: it's a standing body precisely for these purposes and say, "We're thinking of siting the HEP over here. Let's have a discussion about it".	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of Arbitration indeed that's going to turn around to India and say, "Tear down this dam". So the design criteria are Pakistan's only protection. They have to be got right from the outset, because once it's sunk in concrete, facts on the ground
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of a HEP, it needs to come along to Pakistan in the Commission that's the purpose of the Commission: it's a standing body precisely for these purposes and say, "We're thinking of siting the HEP over here. Let's have a discussion about it". Part of the difficulty and you will have picked this up from what we've had to say already is that Pakistan is, on occasion, having to identify where India 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of Arbitration indeed that's going to turn around to India and say, "Tear down this dam". So the design criteria are Pakistan's only protection. They have to be got right from the outset, because once it's sunk in concrete, facts on the ground become very, very difficult to unwind.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of a HEP, it needs to come along to Pakistan in the Commission that's the purpose of the Commission: it's a standing body precisely for these purposes and say, "We're thinking of siting the HEP over here. Let's have a discussion about it". Part of the difficulty and you will have picked this up from what we've had to say already is that 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of Arbitration indeed that's going to turn around to India and say, "Tear down this dam". So the design criteria are Pakistan's only protection. They have to be got right from the outset, because once it's sunk in concrete, facts on the ground become very, very difficult to unwind. I have three brief points of detail to recall about
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of a HEP, it needs to come along to Pakistan in the Commission that's the purpose of the Commission: it's a standing body precisely for these purposes and say, "We're thinking of siting the HEP over here. Let's have a discussion about it". Part of the difficulty and you will have picked this up from what we've had to say already is that Pakistan is, on occasion, having to identify where India is planning to site its HEPs from press reports or from 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of Arbitration indeed that's going to turn around to India and say, "Tear down this dam". So the design criteria are Pakistan's only protection. They have to be got right from the outset, because once it's sunk in concrete, facts on the ground become very, very difficult to unwind. I have three brief points of detail to recall about pondage. You've heard a lot about pondage today, and we have committed ourselves to coming back to a range of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 interpretation, because the siting of a HEP would undoubtedly cause an interference with the waters. So India cannot say to itself: well, Article VII(2) is not engaged because this siting of a HEP doesn't materially interfere with the waters. I mean, that would just be nonsensical. But in circumstances in which any engineering work would cause an interference with the water, that party: " shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." And we say and I think, Mr Minear, this was perhaps in response to a question from you we say that when India begins to contemplate the siting of a HEP, it needs to come along to Pakistan in the Commission that's the purpose of the Commission: it's a standing body precisely for these purposes and say, "We're thinking of siting the HEP over here. Let's have a discussion about it". Part of the difficulty and you will have picked this up from what we've had to say already is that Pakistan is, on occasion, having to identify where India 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	regulatory challenges. But there are always solutions, if those challenges are addressed preemptively rather than after the fact, but certainly not when the works are sunk in concrete, as Pakistan is facing. We initiated these proceedings on 19 August 2016, when we had a concern about the Kishenganga dam. We included in that original Request for Arbitration a request for interim measures because we wanted to forestall the works being sunk in concrete. The World Bank sat on its hands for six years. Kishenganga is sunk in concrete and operating. Now in the Kishenganga proceedings, in the interim award, there was some discussion about "own risk". And "own risk" is all very well as a principle for lawyers to talk about. It's going to be a very brave Court of Arbitration indeed that's going to turn around to India and say, "Tear down this dam". So the design criteria are Pakistan's only protection. They have to be got right from the outset, because once it's sunk in concrete, facts on the ground become very, very difficult to unwind. I have three brief points of detail to recall about pondage. You've heard a lot about pondage today, and we

16:51 1	the questions that have been asked by members of the	16:54 1	need to take account of.
2	Court next week. But just three points.	2	And I forget which members of the Court put their
3	The definition of "Firm Power" under the Treaty,	3	finger on this, but it seemed to be very prescient
4	which is the basis for the calculation of pondage, is	4	putting a finger on it, that the difference between
5	based on hydrology of the river, not on a plant's	5	Pakistan's and India's approach is that Pakistan is
6	installed capacity. And it must be so. It cannot be	6	driven by hydrology, whereas India is driven by load.
7	that India could come along and say to Pakistan, "We	7	There is a fundamental difference. There is just no
8	want to build a 2,000 MW plant, and because we want to	8	getting away from that fact. That's a fact that you're
9	build a 2,000 MW plant on the Chenab River or on the	9	going to have to grapple with. We think, obviously,
10	Neelum, you have to give us X amount of pondage". It	10	that our approach is driven by an authentic
10	just does not comport with the raison d'être of the	10	interpretation of the Treaty.
11	Treaty to say that installed capacity is what drives	11	If I could just read to you paragraph 8(c), but by
12	pondage. It's the hydrology of the river.	12	adjusting some of the words a little bit, just to remove
13	And it cannot be the place of the plant in India's	13	the language of pondage. It would say:
14	unilateral conception, in a dark room somewhere in	15	"The maximum [volume of usable water for operating
15	Delhi, about how much that particular plant is going to	15	purposes] shall not exceed twice the [stored water]
10	be providing to the grid, the load of the plant, because	10	required for Firm Power."
18	that could change from day to day to day to day, or	18	[If] we just take the confusion of this word
10	India could come to Pakistan and say, "This is the	10	"Pondage" out of the picture, then we think it becomes
20	amount that we consider that the plant in question will	20	abundantly clear:
20	provide to the grid", and give a massively overinflated	20	"The maximum [volume of usable water for operating
21	amount, just in order to get the pondage; and then to	21	purposes] shall not exceed twice the [stored water]
22	use the pondage, have it sit around, or to have it	22	required for Firm Power."
23	sitting there as a sword of Damocles over Pakistan's	23	That will make it absolutely clear that what we're
25	head.	25	talking about is hydrology; we're not talking about
20		25	taiking about is nyarotogy, we to not taiking about
	Page 229		Page 231
16:52 1	So it's not the question of installed capacity, not	16:55 1	load.
2	the plant's anticipated contribution to the grid.	2	Dr Miles put a slide on the screen which took you to
3	And it's not the possibility either of secondary	3	some of India's articulation of its position, and we
4	power. 8(b) provides that in the design of the plant,	4	· · ·
5			think that that's where the mangle started.
	india must take into account the possibility of	5	think that that's where the mangle started. Then of course there is the definition of "Firm
6	India must take into account the possibility of secondary power. But secondary power is not to be	5 6	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm
6 7	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be	5 6 7	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go
7		6 7	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm
	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when	6	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may
7 8	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the	6 7 8	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm
7 8 9	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of	6 7 8 9	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on
7 8 9 10	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty.	6 7 8 9 10	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology.
7 8 9 10 11	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage	6 7 8 9 10 11	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question
7 8 9 10 11 12	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come up with.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your question about the extent to which, if you like, there
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come up with. But in essence, the calculation of the maximum	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your question about the extent to which, if you like, there is a ghost of the normal meaning which somehow informs
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come up with. But in essence, the calculation of the maximum allowable pondage rests on two provisions of the Treaty,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your question about the extent to which, if you like, there is a ghost of the normal meaning which somehow informs the interpretation of a special meaning. But we will
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come up with. But in essence, the calculation of the maximum allowable pondage rests on two provisions of the Treaty, and two provisions only: it rests on paragraph 8(c),	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your question about the extent to which, if you like, there is a ghost of the normal meaning which somehow informs the interpretation of a special meaning. But we will come back to that next week.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come up with. But in essence, the calculation of the maximum allowable pondage rests on two provisions of the Treaty, and two provisions only: it rests on paragraph 8(c), which is the formula for the calculation of pondage; and that refers back to 2(i), to firm power. Other provisions of the Treaty may be relevant in the margins,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your question about the extent to which, if you like, there is a ghost of the normal meaning which somehow informs the interpretation of a special meaning. But we will come back to that next week. Our view is that the calculation of pondage is based
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come up with. But in essence, the calculation of the maximum allowable pondage rests on two provisions of the Treaty, and two provisions only: it rests on paragraph 8(c), which is the formula for the calculation of pondage; and that refers back to 2(i), to firm power. Other	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your question about the extent to which, if you like, there is a ghost of the normal meaning which somehow informs the interpretation of a special meaning. But we will come back to that next week. Our view is that the calculation of pondage is based solely on the hydrology of the river. And we don't see
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come up with. But in essence, the calculation of the maximum allowable pondage rests on two provisions of the Treaty, and two provisions only: it rests on paragraph 8(c), which is the formula for the calculation of pondage; and that refers back to 2(i), to firm power. Other provisions of the Treaty may be relevant in the margins,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your question about the extent to which, if you like, there is a ghost of the normal meaning which somehow informs the interpretation of a special meaning. But we will come back to that next week. Our view is that the calculation of pondage is based solely on the hydrology of the river. And we don't see how any other approach could work, because it would be
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come up with. But in essence, the calculation of the maximum allowable pondage rests on two provisions of the Treaty, and two provisions only: it rests on paragraph 8(c), which is the formula for the calculation of pondage; and that refers back to 2(i), to firm power. Other provisions of the Treaty may be relevant in the margins, or to test the analysis. But these two provisions of the Treaty we think are the only two provisions that you	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your question about the extent to which, if you like, there is a ghost of the normal meaning which somehow informs the interpretation of a special meaning. But we will come back to that next week. Our view is that the calculation of pondage is based solely on the hydrology of the river. And we don't see how any other approach could work, because it would be completely open to abuse by India, completely unrealistic: my example of a 2,000 MW plant which bore
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	secondary power. But secondary power is not to be equated to pondage. That would be the flow of the water, for example, during the monsoon period, when water is plentiful. And you'll find the definition of "Secondary Power" in paragraph 2(j) of the Treaty. My second point about the calculation of pondage and I think, Mr Chairman, I think the Court certainly has this, because it was an element of the exchange with Dr Miles in which various members of the Court were speculating about an even simpler approach than what we thought was the most simple approach that we could come up with. But in essence, the calculation of the maximum allowable pondage rests on two provisions of the Treaty, and two provisions only: it rests on paragraph 8(c), which is the formula for the calculation of pondage; and that refers back to 2(i), to firm power. Other provisions of the Treaty may be relevant in the margins, or to test the analysis. But these two provisions of	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Then of course there is the definition of "Firm Power" in [paragraph] 2(i). And I don't propose to go into it; you've heard a lot about it already, and we may come back to it next week. But the definition of "Firm Power" in 2(i) is a definition that's based on hydrology. Now, we will come back, Mr Minear, to your question in the last few days. One of the reasons why we've been hesitating to do so, apart from the cadence of our having to work up our submissions, is we want to go back, I think, and have a look at those US cases I think that you referred us to, if memory serves me: your question about the extent to which, if you like, there is a ghost of the normal meaning which somehow informs the interpretation of a special meaning. But we will come back to that next week. Our view is that the calculation of pondage is based solely on the hydrology of the river. And we don't see how any other approach could work, because it would be completely open to abuse by India, completely

16:57 1	no relationship to the flow of the river at all, and	17:00 1	that there is a parallel process, which you've also
2	then saying, "Well, we need to store this huge amount of	2	addressed in PO6. The exercise of competence, in the
3	water by way of pondage because we are hinging it on	3	circumstances, is also addressed in PO6, and this is
4	installed capacity, or we're hinging it on load, or	4	without prejudice to the coming phases.
5	we're hinging it on some hypothetical backroom cook-up	5	So when you give your systemic interpretation in
6	of how much this particular plant is going to contribute	6	your award in the first phase of the merits, you're
7	to the Indian electricity grid". It's not going to	7	obviously going to have to have a very careful eye on
8	play.	8	how this is going to play if the second phase on the
9	Once the calculation has been done on the hydrology	9	merits comes back to this Court and you then have to
10	of the river, "Firm Power" under 2(i), this must	10	address the Kishenganga plant and the Ratle plant. Or
11	thereafter then be applied to the normal operation of	11	how is it going to play if your systemic interpretation,
12	a run-of-river HEP. And it comes to the issue of the	12	[in the] first phase on the merits, then goes to the
13	operating cycle or some other time component: is it	13	Neutral Expert, and the Neutral Expert is then going to
14	daily, 24 hours, versus weekly?	14	apply it to Kishenganga or Ratle. Or none of those, and
15	I have to say quite candidly: this is an issue of	15	that we move on to a dispute in due course about some
16	Treaty interpretation, because the Treaty does not say	16	other plant, and how is that going to be picked up in
17	it in terms. And we have struggled time and again. One	17	practical terms. So it's going to have to be very
18	of the reasons why there's been a change in methodology	18	precisely and clearly calibrated, as I mentioned the
19	in Pakistan's calculation is that we've gone back to	19	other day.
20	Treaty to try and see what the best element is of the	20	Now, it remains to be seen what happens with the
21	time cycle. And you have seen this set out in our	21	Neutral Expert process, insofar as what's on the public
22	Memorial, and Dr Miles has addressed it. And if needs	22	record. I've already told you that there is going to be
23	be, we'll come back to it again next week.	23	a paragraph 7 competence hearing, which takes place in
24 25	It seems to us, on the basis of a rigorous analysis	24	September, again on the public record. Then there will
25	of the Treaty, that the only approach that recommends	25	have to be a decision. We have reserved our position,
	Page 233		Page 235
16:58 1	itself is a 24-hour cycle, not only because that's the	17:01 1	in my submissions to you, about paragraph 13, if the
16:58 1 2	itself is a 24-hour cycle, not only because that's the approach that's written into the Treaty but because	17:01 1 2	in my submissions to you, about paragraph 13, if the Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that
2	approach that's written into the Treaty but because	17:01 1 2 3	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that
	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or	2	
2 3	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river	2 3	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise.
2 3 4	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or	2 3 4	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your
2 3 4 5	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge	2 3 4 5	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award.
2 3 4 5 6	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants	2 3 4 5 6	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to
2 3 4 5 6 7	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought it was important to do so. But I'm going to go move on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for something that you think you needed to address.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought it was important to do so. But I'm going to go move on quite quickly, if I may, to a number of framing	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for something that you think you needed to address. You're obviously going to be influenced by your
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought it was important to do so. But I'm going to go move on quite quickly, if I may, to a number of framing considerations for your task in the first phase of the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for something that you think you needed to address. You're obviously going to be influenced by your appreciation of India's case in the Baglihar and
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought it was important to do so. But I'm going to go move on quite quickly, if I may, to a number of framing considerations for your task in the first phase of the merits.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for something that you think you needed to address. You're obviously going to be influenced by your appreciation of India's case in the Baglihar and Kishenganga pleadings, and other Indian documents and
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought it was important to do so. But I'm going to go move on quite quickly, if I may, to a number of framing considerations for your task in the first phase of the merits. There are a number of documents and principles that	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for something that you think you needed to address. You're obviously going to be influenced by your appreciation of India's case in the Baglihar and Kishenganga pleadings, and other Indian documents and materials, and Pakistan's characterisation of India's
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought it was important to do so. But I'm going to go move on quite quickly, if I may, to a number of framing considerations for your task in the first phase of the merits. There are a number of documents and principles that will frame your task. Your Competence Award says 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for something that you think you needed to address. You're obviously going to be influenced by your appreciation of India's case in the Baglihar and Kishenganga pleadings, and other Indian documents and materials, and Pakistan's characterisation of India's case.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought it was important to do so. But I'm going to go move on quite quickly, if I may, to a number of framing considerations for your task in the first phase of the merits. There are a number of documents and principles that	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for something that you think you needed to address. You're obviously going to be influenced by your appreciation of India's case in the Baglihar and Kishenganga pleadings, and other Indian documents and materials, and Pakistan's characterisation of India's
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought it was important to do so. But I'm going to go move on quite quickly, if I may, to a number of framing considerations for your task in the first phase of the merits. There are a number of documents and principles that will frame your task. Your Competence Award says competence without limitation. There is an appreciation	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for something that you think you needed to address. You're obviously going to be influenced by your appreciation of India's case in the Baglihar and Kishenganga pleadings, and other Indian documents and materials, and Pakistan's characterisation of India's case.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 approach that's written into the Treaty but because that's the approach that seems to comport with or does comport with the nature of these run-of-river plants, in respect of HEPs in which there is a huge seasonal variation of water. These are peaking plants during the dry season. So that's the time period. We think that this is a question of Treaty interpretation, because it's not written into the Treaty. Obviously it's informed by engineering considerations. And one of the issues that you will no doubt be discussing in your deliberations, the lawyers and the engineers together, is whether, with all the engineering learning on the Court, there is anything other than a 24-hour cycle relating to the operation of the plants that is relevant. Now I know time is short. And I've spent more time than I wanted on these opening provisions, but I thought it was important to do so. But I'm going to go move on quite quickly, if I may, to a number of framing considerations for your task in the first phase of the merits. There are a number of documents and principles that will frame your task. Your Competence Award says 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	Neutral Expert goes beyond his competence. I hope that doesn't arise. So the first document that's going to frame your deliberations is going to be your Competence Award. Then there's going to be PO6, and I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then there is going to be Pakistan's Amended Request for Arbitration, our Memorial, our hearing evidence and submissions, and our final submissions. And that's important for the reason that Professor Tanzi noted: that obviously you are going to be, in some sense, bound by our petita, the petita of our case. And that's one of the reasons why, in our final submissions, it goes on for two or three pages. We wanted to make sure that we put into our request for relief everything that we could think that we would need because we didn't want you to be faced with a circumstance where we didn't ask for something that you think you needed to address. You're obviously going to be influenced by your appreciation of India's case in the Baglihar and Kishenganga pleadings, and other Indian documents and materials, and Pakistan's characterisation of India's case.

17:02 1	[that] India cannot strengthen its case by the device of	17:05 1	Relevance of PO6.
2	not being here.	2	PO6 is the origin of these proceedings; the
3	There is a closely related and important	3	questions to which we were directed in paragraph 35.
4	consideration to this, and that is that India cannot be	4	But this proceeding, and your award in due course in
5	permitted, following your award, to challenge or dismiss	5	this systemic phase, is going to have to go beyond the
6	it on the ground that you based your award on a mistaken	6	questions that are articulated in paragraph 35.
7	appreciation of India's case, a case that might then be	7	Also relevant are other elements of PO6, when it
8	hastily reconceived in the light of your award.	8	comes to considering the scope of your award. Because
9	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, we do anticipate	9	the dispute is not just a dispute about systemic
10	that that is a very real risk, and a very real concern,	10	interpretation; it is also a dispute about the KHEP and
11	that you give your award on systemic interpretation and	11	the RHEP. So you will have to have one eye on how your
12	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	12	award will or may be applied in other circumstances:
13	•	13	whether it's the KHEP or the RHEP, whether it's to other
14		14	of the 201 dams, hydroelectric plants, that India is
15		15	planning.
16		16	So I come back to the point that I made in opening:
17		17	this is not an advisory opinion, this is not
18	•	18	a hypothetical case. The award that you're going to
19		19	give is going to have to be real and concrete and able
20	-	20	to be applied.
21		21	The Court has reserved its position on the
22		22	competence of the Neutral Expert; that's PO6,
23	•	23	paragraphs 27 and 28. We are proceeding on the basis
24		24	that the Neutral Expert may be competent, but he hasn't
25	you may find against us that it doesn't go off the	25	yet addressed his competence; that's a matter that
	Page 237		Page 239
	6		
17:04 1		17:07 1	we will be coming to in due course. And as I have said
2	hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore	2	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its
2	hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion".	2 3	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13
2 3 4	hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion".Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able	2 3 4	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat.
2 3 4 5	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral 	2 3 4 5	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit,
2 3 4 5 6	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we 	2 3 4 5 6	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general
2 3 4 5 6 7	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your award. So it is relevant in respect of the res judicata 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're faced.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 10 17 18	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your award. So it is relevant in respect of the res judicata aspect of your awards, or the awards that you will 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're faced. But this was the basis on which you organised your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your award. So it is relevant in respect of the res judicata aspect of your awards, or the awards that you will issue. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're faced. But this was the basis on which you organised your proceedings. So it's going to be relevant to the way in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your award. So it is relevant in respect of the res judicata aspect of your awards, or the awards that you will issue. Now beyond the issues addressed in the Competence 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're faced. But this was the basis on which you organised your proceedings. So it's going to be relevant to the way in which you organise your award, and these
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21$	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your award. So it is relevant in respect of the res judicata aspect of your awards, or the awards that you will issue. Now beyond the issues addressed in the Competence Award, in PO6, in all of the pleadings, our pleadings, 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're faced. But this was the basis on which you organised your proceedings. So it's going to be relevant to the way in which you organise your award, and these non-paragraph 35 elements will be relevant to what you
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22$	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your award. So it is relevant in respect of the res judicata aspect of your awards, or the awards that you will issue. Now beyond the issues addressed in the Competence Award, in PO6, in all of the pleadings, our pleadings, India's position, you will also need to consider 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're faced. But this was the basis on which you organised your proceedings. So it's going to be relevant to the way in which you organise your award, and these non-paragraph 35 elements will be relevant to what you will need to address when it comes to the issues with
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 23 \\ 23 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your award. So it is relevant in respect of the res judicata aspect of your awards, or the awards that you will issue. Now beyond the issues addressed in the Competence Award, in PO6, in all of the pleadings, our pleadings, India's position, you will also need to consider ancillary issues or other relevant questions that may be 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're faced. But this was the basis on which you organised your proceedings. So it's going to be relevant to the way in which you organise your award, and these non-paragraph 35 elements will be relevant to what you will need to address when it comes to the issues with which you are seised.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your award. So it is relevant in respect of the res judicata aspect of your awards, or the awards that you will issue. Now beyond the issues addressed in the Competence Award, in PO6, in all of the pleadings, our pleadings, India's position, you will also need to consider ancillary issues or other relevant questions that may be required or warranted by your enquiry. And I'll come 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're faced. But this was the basis on which you organised your proceedings. So it's going to be relevant to the way in which you organise your award, and these non-paragraph 35 elements will be relevant to what you will need to address when it comes to the issues with which you are seised. So, in other words, you are not, we say, constrained
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 23 \\ 23 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	 hands and says, "Didn't have our arguments, therefore reached the wrong conclusion". Now let me say, within the limits of what I am able to say, what is in the public domain of the Neutral Expert proceedings. Pakistan knows India's case, as we have India's memorial in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We cannot put it before you, at least not without the permission of the Neutral Expert following a formal application. We cannot make that application at this point. But we know what India's case is. Now I cannot say anything more about that. And in due course, these issues may be relevant. I hope they are not. But it is an issue that this Court needs to be aware of, because this is a dispute that is going to continue outside of this courtroom once you render your award. So it is relevant in respect of the res judicata aspect of your awards, or the awards that you will issue. Now beyond the issues addressed in the Competence Award, in PO6, in all of the pleadings, our pleadings, India's position, you will also need to consider ancillary issues or other relevant questions that may be required or warranted by your enquiry. And I'll come 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	a number of times already, Pakistan has reserved its position, particularly with regards to the paragraph 13 caveat. What's also going to inform your award, we submit, is your identification and articulation of "the general duty of mutual respect and comity" in paragraphs 31 to 33 of Procedural Order No. 6. You set this out very clearly, immensely clearly, but you only unpacked it a little bit; and you only unpacked it a little bit in the context of the organisation of the proceedings. You didn't unpack it any further. It may be that when it comes to your award, you will feel the need to unpack it a little bit further so that everybody knows what this general duty of mutual respect and comity actually requires in the kind of circumstances with which we're faced. But this was the basis on which you organised your proceedings. So it's going to be relevant to the way in which you organise your award, and these non-paragraph 35 elements will be relevant to what you will need to address when it comes to the issues with which you are seised.

17:08 1	exercise of systemic interpretation in which you are	17:11 1	going need to be addressed.
2	engaged. And there are ancillary questions of	2	We have asked you expressly in our request for
3	interpretation relevant to Article III and paragraph 8,	3	relief to address the nature and character of the
4	and we have addressed some of these in our Memorial at	4	Treaty, because we think that that is absolutely
5	paragraph 13.19, and I will touch upon some of those in	5	essential to the proper exercise of interpretation. We
6	just a moment.	6	have asked you expressly, in the request for relief, to
7	So I turn to my next heading, which is, "What is to	7	address the relationship, for interpretative purposes,
8	be addressed, in what form and when?", and start off	8	between headline obligations and exceptions. We have
9	with: what is to be addressed?	9	asked you expressly, in the request for relief, to
10	Obviously to be addressed are the paragraph 35	10	address best practices in the service of the Treaty, but
11	questions, and other specified questions, such as	11	not in circumvention of it.
12	question 35(a), which is the res judicata question.	12	So we have, with apologies, but by intention, put
13	There are also ancillary questions, because it is	13	a very, very heavy load on your plate. We'll come back
14	unlikely that you will be able to just say in your	14	to the issue of timing in just a moment.
15	award, "This is the Court's answer to question 35(a),	15	But there are also some issues that are not on your
16	(b), (c), (d) through to (g)". There are going to be	16	agenda in this phase, notably any dispute about the KHEP
17	other things that you are going to have to address along	17	or the RHEP. They're not on your agenda. They're not
18	the way. And indeed, we have asked you in our petita to	18	before the Court. You don't have submissions and
19	address some other questions along the way. We've	19	evidence. You cannot possibly reach any conclusion
20	identified some.	20	about the KHEP and the RHEP. And all of this is pending
21	So, for example, in our Memorial at paragraph 13.18,	21	clarification of the competence of the Neutral Expert.
22	we have said:	22	I just say just so that I reference it, but we'll
23	"The Court's Award should also give the fullest	23	come back to it in due course that Pakistan welcomes
24	possible guidance to the Neutral Expert in the parallel	24	the Chairman's summary of the five sequential steps for
25	proceedings, and to any Neutral Expert who may be	25	applying sources of law practice that are at the heart
	Page 241		Page 243
			-
17:09 1	appointed in other cases in due course, to enable them	17:12 1	of Pakistan's Memorial. This was at transcript Day 3,
17:09 1 2	appointed in other cases in due course, to enable them to determine differences of which they may be properly	17:12 1 2	of Pakistan's Memorial. This was at transcript Day 3, pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We
	**		pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be
2	to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the	2	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We
2 3	to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty."	2 3	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance.
2 3 4	to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita	2 3 4	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for
2 3 4 5 6 7	to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you	2 3 4 5 6 7	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance.So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance.So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance.So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application. The award will need to be, on these points, precise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. And we anticipate and we've set this out in our Memorial that there will be other relevant questions 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application. The award will need to be, on these points, precise and certain and in granular form. And to avoid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. And we anticipate and we've set this out in our Memorial that there will be other relevant questions that are engaged by the Court's enquiry. The unhappy 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application. The award will need to be, on these points, precise and certain and in granular form. And to avoid an unnecessary economy of reasoning, the operative part
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. And we anticipate and we've set this out in our Memorial that there will be other relevant questions that are engaged by the Court's enquiry. The unhappy legacy of the Baglihar determination is not one that 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application. The award will need to be, on these points, precise and certain and in granular form. And to avoid an unnecessary economy of reasoning, the operative part is not constrained by the formulation of the questions
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. And we anticipate and we've set this out in our Memorial that there will be other relevant questions that are engaged by the Court's enquiry. The unhappy legacy of the Baglihar determination is not one that you're going to be able to escape. We think that that 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application. The award will need to be, on these points, precise and certain and in granular form. And to avoid an unnecessary economy of reasoning, the operative part is not constrained by the formulation of the questions posed in paragraph 6.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. And we anticipate and we've set this out in our Memorial that there will be other relevant questions that are engaged by the Court's enquiry. The unhappy legacy of the Baglihar determination is not one that you're going to be able to escape. We think that that needs to be addressed, not for purposes of reopening 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application. The award will need to be, on these points, precise and certain and in granular form. And to avoid an unnecessary economy of reasoning, the operative part is not constrained by the formulation of the questions posed in paragraph 6. So we then come to "when?"
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. And we anticipate and we've set this out in our Memorial that there will be other relevant questions that are engaged by the Court's enquiry. The unhappy legacy of the Baglihar determination is not one that you're going to be able to escape. We think that that needs to be addressed, not for purposes of reopening Baglihar but for purposes of actually setting the Treaty 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application. The award will need to be, on these points, precise and certain and in granular form. And to avoid an unnecessary economy of reasoning, the operative part is not constrained by the formulation of the questions posed in paragraph 6. So we then come to "when?" Mr Chairman, you've already put on our agenda that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. And we anticipate and we've set this out in our Memorial that there will be other relevant questions that are engaged by the Court's enquiry. The unhappy legacy of the Baglihar determination is not one that you're going to be able to escape. We think that that needs to be addressed, not for purposes of reopening 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application. The award will need to be, on these points, precise and certain and in granular form. And to avoid an unnecessary economy of reasoning, the operative part is not constrained by the formulation of the questions posed in paragraph 6. So we then come to "when?"
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 to determine differences of which they may be properly seised without taking them beyond the bounds of their competence as defined by Part 1 of Annexure F of the Treaty." Now as you come to address this within our petita and as part of our Amended Request for Arbitration, you may feel that you need to go beyond questions 35(a) through to (g). In Memorial paragraph 13.18, we have identified that: " the Parties and any other dispute settlement body that may come after this Court, should be as clear as possible about the meaning of Paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f)" Because these are going to be or may be relevant to other disputes. And we anticipate and we've set this out in our Memorial that there will be other relevant questions that are engaged by the Court's enquiry. The unhappy legacy of the Baglihar determination is not one that you're going to be able to escape. We think that that needs to be addressed, not for purposes of reopening Baglihar but for purposes of actually setting the Treaty 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	pages 221 to 222, and we will come back to that. We think that something along these lines is going to be exactly what is required by the Court in order to give us guidance. So then I come to "in what form?" We have asked for a narrative dispositif because we think that some form of a dispositif which is more than merely a staccato statement of short sentences is going to be necessary to address the concerns that we have; that we have brought to you in this dispute. Professor Tanzi has addressed that. We think there is lots of scope for the Court to write a dispositif as it thinks appropriate to address the issues: a considered and reasoned award which through both its analysis and its conclusions, not just its operative part is what is necessary to provide guidance on interpretation and application. The award will need to be, on these points, precise and certain and in granular form. And to avoid an unnecessary economy of reasoning, the operative part is not constrained by the formulation of the questions posed in paragraph 6. So we then come to "when?" Mr Chairman, you've already put on our agenda that

-		1	
17:13 1	more than six months. It's going to take the Court more	17:17 1	"Having regard to the preceding, and the submissions
2	than six months plus six months, we expect. As I said	2	advanced in this Memorial"
3	initially, and I'll say again, you will not have us	3	To which we will add "this hearing":
4	driving you or agitating for an award to be rendered	4	" Pakistan respectfully requests the Court:
5	speedily. These are big issues: we want them to be	5	A. To set out its findings on the issues engaged by
6	clearly considered. And we will look forward to getting	6	this Phase of the proceedings in a narrative dispositif
7	the award from you when we get the award.	7	that elaborates in detail and in prescriptive terms the
8	As to the issue of the preliminary partial award,	8	overall interpretation and application of Article III
9	Mr Chairman, as you raised, I'm going to come back to	9	and Paragraph 8 of the Treaty, and in particular what is
10	that next week, rather than address it now, if I may.	10	required for purposes of compliance with the design
10	So what I would like to do and I'm going to do	10	criteria of Paragraph 8 of Annexure D and [any] other
11	this very quickly, and we will certainly end by 5.30	11	relevant provision[] of the Treaty"
12	is I'm going to ask my colleagues if they can put on the	12	I'm not going to read out the whole of the final
13	screen our final submissions from our Memorial. That's	13	submissions, but just walk you through some of them. So
14	paragraphs 13.29 to 13.30. (Pause)	14	that's paragraph A, the narrative dispositif.
15	Perhaps you have them in front of you, in which case	15	Then B:
10	we don't need the screen. While we're looking at that,	10	
17	I'll just make one or two preliminary points.	17	"Having regards to the facts, evidence and law
	So the final submissions with all the formality		to adjudge and declare: (i) the nature and character of the Treaty, and the
19 20	-	19 20	-
20	of the signature of the Deputy Agent, and it will be		bargains reflected in the Treaty in the terms addressed
21	spoken probably by the Secretary of the Ministry of	21	in Chapter 7 [and our submissions]"
22	Water Resources, who will be coming over the weekend, so	22	So here we are asking you to address the character
23	the most senior figure in the Ministry of Water will be	23	of the Treaty and the nature of the bargains: peace,
24	here, so you will have it from him, in a Pakistani	24	Treaty and hydro bargain. As we said in the Memorial,
25	voice, not from counsel we will address next week.	25	we certainly do not intend to be prescriptive about the
	Page 245		Page 247
17.15 1	We will be unsurprisingly undating the final	17.18 1	language that we use the terms that we use. You will
17:15 1	We will be, unsurprisingly, updating the final submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance	17:18 1	language that we use, the terms that we use. You will
2	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance	2	come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for
2 3	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in	2 3	come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you
2 3 4	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced	2 3 4	come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues.
2 3 4 5	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply	2 3 4 5	come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then:
2 3 4 5 6	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions	2 3 4 5 6	come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of
2 3 4 5 6 7	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to	2 3 4 5 6 7	come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these provisions just to make one or two passing points.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not necessarily the timing of it, but that your award will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these provisions just to make one or two passing points. (Pause)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not necessarily the timing of it, but that your award will deal with exactly the kinds of issues that you are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these provisions just to make one or two passing points. (Pause) We're going to go down to paragraph 13.29 of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not necessarily the timing of it, but that your award will deal with exactly the kinds of issues that you are contemplating under 35(a). And we will address that in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these provisions just to make one or two passing points. (Pause) We're going to go down to paragraph 13.29 of the Memorial. Obviously the reason for the detail of the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not necessarily the timing of it, but that you award will deal with exactly the kinds of issues that you are contemplating under 35(a). And we will address that in due course next week.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these provisions just to make one or two passing points. (Pause) We're going to go down to paragraph 13.29 of the Memorial. Obviously the reason for the detail of the request is to ensure that everything that we thought we	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not necessarily the timing of it, but that your award will deal with exactly the kinds of issues that you are contemplating under 35(a). And we will address that in due course next week. Then:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these provisions just to make one or two passing points. (Pause) We're going to go down to paragraph 13.29 of the Memorial. Obviously the reason for the detail of the request is to ensure that everything that we thought we might need are within the petita of the proceedings;	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not necessarily the timing of it, but that your award will deal with exactly the kinds of issues that you are contemplating under 35(a). And we will address that in due course next week. Then: "(iii) the relationship, for interpretative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these provisions just to make one or two passing points. (Pause) We're going to go down to paragraph 13.29 of the Memorial. Obviously the reason for the detail of the request is to ensure that everything that we thought we might need are within the petita of the proceedings; we didn't want to leave anything out.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not necessarily the timing of it, but that your award will deal with exactly the kinds of issues that you are contemplating under 35(a). And we will address that in due course next week. Then: "(iii) the relationship, for interpretative purposes, between the headline obligations and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these provisions just to make one or two passing points. (Pause) We're going to go down to paragraph 13.29 of the Memorial. Obviously the reason for the detail of the request is to ensure that everything that we thought we might need are within the petita of the proceedings;	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not necessarily the timing of it, but that your award will deal with exactly the kinds of issues that you are contemplating under 35(a). And we will address that in due course next week. Then: "(iii) the relationship, for interpretative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	submissions a little bit, but not in terms of substance but just because, as you will see, there are passages in the final submissions that refer to submissions advanced and evidence adduced in the Memorial. And we are simply going to be adding to that, and to the submissions advanced and evidence adduced during the hearing, and to any submissions that may be advanced and evidence adduced in any post-hearing submissions that may be directed by the Court. So we will be updating the final submissions, but only in terms of these admin points. We think that the final submissions cover the ground sufficiently fully that they stand up to scrutiny in the light of the hearing, although we will of course review that when the dust has settled on this week. But I would just like to walk you through these provisions just to make one or two passing points. (Pause) We're going to go down to paragraph 13.29 of the Memorial. Obviously the reason for the detail of the request is to ensure that everything that we thought we might need are within the petita of the proceedings; we didn't want to leave anything out.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 come up with your own analysis. We are not looking for you to rubber-stamp our analysis, but we are asking you to address those issues. Then: "(ii) the binding or otherwise controlling effect of the decisions of past dispute resolution bodies addressed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere in [the] Memorial, with respect to: (a) the parties; (b) the present proceedings before the Court; (c) the present proceedings before the Neutral Expert; and (d) future proceedings before a court or a neutral expert" So, Mr Chairman, we had, in this aspect of our final request for relief, perhaps precisely in mind not necessarily the timing of it, but that your award will deal with exactly the kinds of issues that you are contemplating under 35(a). And we will address that in due course next week. Then: "(iii) the relationship, for interpretative purposes, between the headline obligations and

17:19 1	We are asking you to address that.	17:22 1	elements that are set out there are requests for
2	"(iv) that engineering 'best practices' can and must	2	post-award directions:
3	be used for purposes of complying with the design	3	"To convene a case management conference of the
4	criteria and operational constraints in Part 3 of	4	Parties for the purpose of considering:
5	Annexure D of the Treaty, but that 'best practices'	5	(i) the status of parallel proceedings
6	cannot be relied upon to circumvent the requirements of	6	(ii) what engagement, if any, the Court should
7	the Treaty"	7	undertake with the Neutral Expert
8	We are asking you to address that. Because that	8	(iii) the need for directions"
9	will make it clear to India that it can and should and	9	Now I should say, it's not just post-award
10	must use best practices in complying with its Treaty	10	directions, because it may be and this is completely
11	obligations, but it cannot use best practices as	11	compatible with your procedural orders and your
12	an excuse, as a device to get outside the scope of	12	Supplemental Rules it may be that we feel the need to
13	the Treaty.	13	come to you before your award on these issues to raise
14	"(v) with respect to the interpretation and	14	some of these points. But the intention of these
15	application of Paragraph 8(d) what is to be taken	15	further requests for relief was to set an anticipatory
16	into account what is to be excluded", et cetera.	16	agenda of how things would move forward.
17	Then the subsequent paragraphs go through these	17	So then we have B:
18	sequentially. So (v) is paragraph 8(d), (vi) is	18	"To give such directions as may be necessary and
19	paragraph 8(e), (vii) is paragraph 8(f), (viii) is	19	warranted for the scheduling and conduct of further
20	paragraph 8(c), (ix) is paragraph 8(a).	20	phases of the proceedings"
21	And then we've got two hold-alls, unsurprising, very	21	Because you will not become functus officio, you
22	common in requests for relief:	22	will not go off into this good night once you render
23	"(x) any other findings as the Court may consider to	23	your award. You will be here.
24	be necessary or warranted for purposes of providing	24	"To reserve any issue of costs in respect of the
25	controlling guidance on the interpretation and	25	present phase of the proceedings for decision by the
	Page 249		Page 251
17:20 1	application of, and relationship between:"	17:23 1	Court in due course"
17:20 1 2	application of, and relationship between:" Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f).	17:23 1 2	Court in due course" And I note that one of the reasons why we are
2	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f).	2	And I note that one of the reasons why we are
2 3	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted."	2 3	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to
2 3 4	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider	2 3 4	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs
2 3 4 5	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted."	2 3 4 5	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in
2 3 4 5 6	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and	2 3 4 5 6	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because
2 3 4 5 6 7	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation	2 3 4 5 6 7	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if there is certainty, clarity, an affirmative dispositive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in due course. So we may very well wish to come back to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if there is certainty, clarity, an affirmative dispositive statement about what was agreed in the past, what should	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in due course. So we may very well wish to come back to you on the issue of costs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if there is certainty, clarity, an affirmative dispositive statement about what was agreed in the past, what should be applied in the present. The platform for the future 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in due course. So we may very well wish to come back to you on the issue of costs. And then finally, and this is important, our request
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if there is certainty, clarity, an affirmative dispositive statement about what was agreed in the past, what should be applied in the present. The platform for the future is certainty about the past and agreement about the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in due course. So we may very well wish to come back to you on the issue of costs. And then finally, and this is important, our request that you "remain seised of the dispute".
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if there is certainty, clarity, an affirmative dispositive statement about what was agreed in the past, what should be applied in the present. The platform for the future is certainty about the past and agreement about the present. We need a platform that has got deep roots.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in due course. So we may very well wish to come back to you on the issue of costs. And then finally, and this is important, our request that you "remain seised of the dispute".
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if there is certainty, clarity, an affirmative dispositive statement about what was agreed in the past, what should be applied in the present. The platform for the future is certainty about the past and agreement about the present. We need a platform that has got deep roots. Then we can look to all the huge challenges of the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in due course. So we may very well wish to come back to you on the issue of costs. And then finally, and this is important, our request that you "remain seised of the dispute". You have determined in the competence phase that you are competent in respect of the whole of the dispute.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if there is certainty, clarity, an affirmative dispositive statement about what was agreed in the past, what should be applied in the present. The platform for the future is certainty about the past and agreement about the present. We need a platform that has got deep roots. Then we can look to all the huge challenges of the region.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in due course. So we may very well wish to come back to you on the issue of costs. And then finally, and this is important, our request that you "remain seised of the dispute". You have determined in the competence phase that you are competent in respect of the whole of the dispute. When, Mr Chairman, your signature or all of your
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if there is certainty, clarity, an affirmative dispositive statement about what was agreed in the past, what should be applied in the present. The platform for the future is certainty about the past and agreement about the present. We need a platform that has got deep roots. Then we can look to all the huge challenges of the region. And then we've got 13.30, which is Pakistan's	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in due course. So we may very well wish to come back to you on the issue of costs. And then finally, and this is important, our request that you "remain seised of the dispute". You have determined in the competence phase that you are competent in respect of the whole of the dispute. When, Mr Chairman, your signature or all of your signatures go on the bottom of that award in due course,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	Article III, 8(a), 8(c) 8(d), 8(e), 8(f). And then: "(xi) such other findings as the Court may consider to be necessary or warranted." So we hope and certainly this was our purpose and intention that we have encapsulated within these requests for relief everything that we think is going to be necessary from the Court's systemic interpretation award in this first phase on the merits. It's a very big task, we recognise that. This is a dispute that has been brewing from 1992: we think it's time that it is resolved. The only way that Pakistan and India are going to be able to move forward, when it comes to broader issues about climate and broader issues about water, is if there is certainty, clarity, an affirmative dispositive statement about what was agreed in the past, what should be applied in the present. The platform for the future is certainty about the past and agreement about the present. We need a platform that has got deep roots. Then we can look to all the huge challenges of the region.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	And I note that one of the reasons why we are reserving the position on costs is not necessarily to anticipate that you will be issuing an award on costs and there will be big questions about costs in inter-state proceedings, but you will recall because this is addressed expressly in Annexure G of the Treaty that the parties are to share the costs. The costs are only being paid by Pakistan at the moment. And we may want to come back to you on this question of costs. Because India should be on the other side of the courtroom, it should be paying its fair share. It is a Treaty partner. Pakistan is, in the Neutral Expert proceedings, it is paying its costs, it is doing its duty as a good Treaty partner. We expect India to be here, not to be laying the groundwork for challenges in due course. So we may very well wish to come back to you on the issue of costs. And then finally, and this is important, our request that you "remain seised of the dispute". You have determined in the competence phase that you are competent in respect of the whole of the dispute. When, Mr Chairman, your signature or all of your

17:25 1	the first phase of merits on systemic interpretation.	17:28 1	and said, "You have the world's expert on sedimentation,
2	It is not the final award. You will be required to	2	Pakistan, we are trying to decide where to site our
3	remain functus.	3	plant: could we borrow him for purposes of working out
4	Mr Chairman, that's the end of my substantive	4	where the desander should be located?"
5	submissions. I note only that there are one or two	5	Now that may be at the conception stage. There may
6	necessary housekeeping points that we need to address.	6	be a Treaty interpretation [point] that I need to come
7	Because you have left to us, by your letter of 27 May,	7	back and give to you. But that timing, I think, is
8	to decide when we want to come back to you: whether it's	8	going to depend on whether the Treaty is an instrument
9	Monday or Tuesday, or both Monday and Tuesday. And of	9	that is bringing adversaries, who are scratching at each
10	course we are not yet in a position to make that	10	other, together or bringing friends who are cooperating
11	decision because we don't know how many thousands of	11	together. That may be the reality of it.
12	questions you're going to be putting to us.	12	But there is VII(2), and we will see whether we can
13	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Sir Daniel. I think	13	give you a more granular legal response.
14	I can advertise already it will not be in the thousands	14	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I certainly take from that response:
15	range	15	the earliest possible point in time.
16	SIR DANIEL: I'm so relieved by that!	16	SIR DANIEL: Yes.
17	THE CHAIRMAN: and I don't think in the hundreds range	17	THE CHAIRMAN: I think I was reacting a little bit to your
18	either. I won't go further than that though.	18	hope that we engage in relatively granular discussion of
19	Let me just turn to my colleagues to see if they	19	these issues, and that granularity in part may turn on
20	have questions for you, based on your presentation.	20	a sense of at least in Pakistan's mind when is it
21	I have a few, which I don't expect you to answer now,	21	exactly that this type of obligation kicks in. Because
22	but it may just help to hear it orally as you work over	22	so far, the statements have been pretty general in
23	the weekend.	23	nature in that regard.
24	(5.26 pm)	24	SIR DANIEL: I think as far as granularity goes, I wrote
25	Questions from THE COURT	25	down in quotes the Chairman's statement "earliest
	Page 253		Page 255
	1 age 235		1 age 233
17:26 1	THE CHAIRMAN: So first, you did raise Article VII,	17:29 1	possible moment in time". That's good granularity.
17:26 1 2	THE CHAIRMAN: So first, you did raise Article VII, paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question	17:29 1 2	possible moment in time". That's good granularity. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's
	-		
2	paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question	2	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's
2 3	paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more	2 3	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award.
2 3 4	paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to	2 3 4	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to
2 3 4 5	paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII,	2 3 4 5	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic
2 3 4 5 6	paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)?	2 3 4 5 6	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should
2 3 4 5 6 7	paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)?I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? T'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? T'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, should I give you a very quick response now, which is not a legal response but it's going to be relevant to the point? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately move to the step of looking at the pondage required for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, should I give you a very quick response now, which is not a legal response but it's going to be relevant to the point? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately move to the step of looking at the pondage required for firm power without doing any of those other calculations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? T'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, should I give you a very quick response now, which is not a legal response but it's going to be relevant to the point? That is that if, as we would hope, the parties are good Treaty partners, that would happen immediately. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately move to the step of looking at the pondage required for firm power without doing any of those other calculations that are more plant-specific.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? T'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, should I give you a very quick response now, which is not a legal response but it's going to be relevant to the point? That is that if, as we would hope, the parties are good Treaty partners, that would happen immediately. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately move to the step of looking at the pondage required for firm power without doing any of those other calculations that are more plant-specific. So it wasn't clear to me why that was even part of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? T'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, should I give you a very quick response now, which is not a legal response but it's going to be relevant to the point? That is that if, as we would hope, the parties are good Treaty partners, that would happen immediately. Because these are Dr Morris described this as the Treaty divided the watersheds. But these are rivers 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately move to the step of looking at the pondage required for firm power without doing any of those other calculations that are more plant-specific. So it wasn't clear to me why that was even part of the calculus. And again, you can address it now if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? I'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, should I give you a very quick response now, which is not a legal response but it's going to be relevant to the point? That is that if, as we would hope, the parties are good Treaty partners, that would happen immediately. Because these are Dr Morris described this as the Treaty divided the watersheds. But these are rivers 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately move to the step of looking at the pondage required for firm power without doing any of those other calculations that are more plant-specific. So it wasn't clear to me why that was even part of the calculus. And again, you can address it now if you wish, but I'm happy to hear in due course.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? Tm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, should I give you a very quick response now, which is not a legal response but it's going to be relevant to the point? That is that if, as we would hope, the parties are good Treaty partners, that would happen immediately. Because these are Dr Morris described this as the Treaty divided the watersheds. But these are rivers that the parties share. Pakistan has a huge amount of expertise and obviously a very significant interest, as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately move to the step of looking at the pondage required for firm power without doing any of those other calculations that are more plant-specific. So it wasn't clear to me why that was even part of the calculus. And again, you can address it now if you wish, but I'm happy to defer that to in due course.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? Tm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, should I give you a very quick response now, which is not a legal response but it's going to be relevant to the point? That is that if, as we would hope, the parties are good Treaty partners, that would happen immediately. Because these are Dr Morris described this as the Treaty divided the watersheds. But these are rivers that the parties share. Pakistan has a huge amount of expertise and obviously a very significant interest, as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately move to the step of looking at the pondage required for firm power without doing any of those other calculations that are more plant-specific. So it wasn't clear to me why that was even part of the calculus. And again, you can address it now if you wish, but I'm happy to defer that to in due course. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 paragraph (2) in your remarks. And the basic question there is: what does Pakistan think is somewhat more precisely the moment at which India is obligated to cooperate in the sense meant in Article VII, paragraph (2)? T'm reminded in part, I think it was the first site expert's presentation about the differing stages of the planning process: pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies and so on. But a little bit more granular information from you as to when it is that obligation would kick in in Article VII, paragraph (2), sentence 1; recognising that it may not be the same as sentence 2, when Pakistan itself can request information. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, should I give you a very quick response now, which is not a legal response but it's going to be relevant to the point? That is that if, as we would hope, the parties are good Treaty partners, that would happen immediately. Because these are Dr Morris described this as the Treaty divided the watersheds. But these are rivers that the parties share. Pakistan has a huge amount of expertise and obviously a very significant interest, as the downstream riparian. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you can ponder whether that's a standard that reads well in an award. Let me turn to my second question. It relates to the pondage issue. Dr Miles took us through the basic sequence by which Pakistan envisages that pondage should be calculated. And the second step, as I understand it, basically in that sequence is to look at an equation that includes mean minimum discharge, but also things relating to generating head and efficiency and water density and gravity. Ultimately though, it didn't seem to me that that step in the process actually fed into the calculations. It seemed to me that they were very much hydro-oriented; and that once you determine the MMD, you can immediately move to the step of looking at the pondage required for firm power without doing any of those other calculations that are more plant-specific. So it wasn't clear to me why that was even part of the calculus. And again, you can address it now if you wish, but I'm happy to defer that to in due course. SIR DANIEL: I'm happy to defer that to in due course. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

17:31 1	weekly is appropriate. That certainly is also something	17:33 1	and look at that again, and you can help me with that in
2	Dr Miles spoke about. The presentations seemed very	17.55 1	due course on Monday or Tuesday. But that's the type of
3	oriented to the Treaty, which is entirely proper,	3	assessment that I think we need to at least address in
4	looking at the particular language and when it is that	4	some fashion.
5	"weekly" and "daily" appears.	5	SIR DANIEL: And to be clear, we are not saying that there
6	It seemed less oriented toward looking at what might	6	are no references, for example, in the Treaty to
7	have been in the minds of the drafters of the Treaty.	7	"weekly". There are. We find references to "weekly" in
8	And to the extent that we're operating in a space where	8	paragraph 2(c), which is the definition of "Pondage".
		8 9	
9			But when you look across the whole of the Treaty,
10		10	the operating framework that seems to have informed the
11		11 12	drafting of the Treaty seems to be a 24-hour period. And that's unsurprising, because these are intended as
12		12	peaking plants. And as Dr Miles has drawn to your
13			
14 15		14 15	attention, the "twice the [amount of] Pondage required for Firm Power" was intended, we understand, to be, as
15		15	it were, a backstop for India, overly generous. It's
10		10	not only what you require for firm power, but it's twice
17		17	what you require for firm power, on the basis that these
18		18	plants would operate probably in the morning, probably
20		19 20	in the evening, but as peaking plants.
20		20	But again, we'll come back to all of that.
21		21	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think the Treaty analysis is quite
22		22	clear. What to me is less clear is the literature
23	-	23 24	surrounding the Treaty, where, even for peaking plants,
25		24	it doesn't seem that they're necessarily looking at
25		25	
	Page 257		Page 259
17.32 1	that we will be able to address this comprehensively	17:35 1	a daily load but at a weekly load. But again you can
17:32 1	that we will be able to address this comprehensively.	17:35 1	a daily load but at a weekly load. But again, you can
2	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s	2	just take a look at that.
23	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've	2 3	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit
2 3 4	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s	2 3 4	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the
23	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of	2 3 4 5	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the
2 3 4 5	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took	2 3 4	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside
2 3 4 5 6 7	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine	2 3 4 5 6	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you
2 3 4 5 6	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was	2 3 4 5 6 7	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by reference to the conception of what run-of-river HEPs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues that you consider you have to address to make your analysis work. So the petita, I think, confine the relief that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by reference to the conception of what run-of-river HEPs were intended to be when it came to the negotiation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues that you consider you have to address to make your analysis work. So the petita, I think, confine the relief that you can give to us, but I don't think that the petita define
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by reference to the conception of what run-of-river HEPs were intended to be when it came to the negotiation of the Treaty in 1950 and the early 1960s. So without	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues that you consider you have to address to make your analysis work. So the petita, I think, confine the relief that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by reference to the conception of what run-of-river HEPs were intended to be when it came to the negotiation of the Treaty in 1950 and the early 1960s. So without doubt, we will be able to provide you with information	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues that you consider you have to address to make your analysis work. So the petita, I think, confine the relief that you can give to us, but I don't think that the petita define the boundaries of your analysis. And if, as part of your analysis, you consider that you have to or that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by reference to the conception of what run-of-river HEPs were intended to be when it came to the negotiation of the Treaty in 1950 and the early 1960s. So without doubt, we will be able to provide you with information on that. THE CHAIRMAN: That would be helpful.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues that you consider you have to address to make your analysis work. So the petita, I think, confine the relief that you can give to us, but I don't think that the petita define the boundaries of your analysis. And if, as part of your analysis, you consider that you have to or that you should address issues because they are ancillary,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by reference to the conception of what run-of-river HEPs were intended to be when it came to the negotiation of the Treaty in 1950 and the early 1960s. So without doubt, we will be able to provide you with information on that. THE CHAIRMAN: That would be helpful. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues that you consider you have to address to make your analysis work. So the petita, I think, confine the relief that you can give to us, but I don't think that the petita define the boundaries of your analysis. And if, as part of your analysis, you consider that you have to or that you should address issues because they are ancillary, because they are necessary, because otherwise the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by reference to the conception of what run-of-river HEPs were intended to be when it came to the negotiation of the Treaty in 1950 and the early 1960s. So without doubt, we will be able to provide you with information on that. THE CHAIRMAN: That would be helpful. You mentioned the Creager manual: my impression was it used a weekly load curve as it assessed the normal 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues that you consider you have to address to make your analysis work. So the petita, I think, confine the relief that you can give to us, but I don't think that the petita define the boundaries of your analysis. And if, as part of your analysis, you consider that you have to or that you should address issues because they are ancillary, because they are necessary, because otherwise the foundation for your conclusions will not be arrived at,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by reference to the conception of what run-of-river HEPs were intended to be when it came to the negotiation of the Treaty in 1950 and the early 1960s. So without doubt, we will be able to provide you with information on that. THE CHAIRMAN: That would be helpful. You mentioned the Creager manual: my impression was it used a weekly load curve as it assessed the normal 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues that you consider you have to address to make your analysis work. So the petita, I think, confine the relief that you can give to us, but I don't think that the petita define the boundaries of your analysis. And if, as part of your analysis, you consider that you have to or that you should address issues because they are ancillary, because they are necessary, because otherwise the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Some of our number have a whole library now of 1950s civil engineering dam construction manuals. So we've got them all, the Creager & Justin and all the rest of them. You will also recall from our Memorial that we took the trouble to go to Stanford and have someone examine the archives of Raymond Wheeler in case there was anything in his private papers. I think we cite to them once or twice, but we didn't find anything illuminating in General Wheeler's papers. But we have looked at exactly that, at the contemporary issues. And I think that informed our appreciation, because our appreciation was informed not simply by the legal interpretation but by the further testing of the approach that we've settled upon by reference to the conception of what run-of-river HEPs were intended to be when it came to the negotiation of the Treaty in 1950 and the early 1960s. So without doubt, we will be able to provide you with information on that. THE CHAIRMAN: That would be helpful. You mentioned the Creager manual: my impression was it used a weekly load curve as it assessed the normal 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	just take a look at that. My fourth question was that I was a little bit confused: it seemed that you said at the outset that the Court was limited by your petita, but then towards the end of your presentation you said we could go outside the petita. Now maybe I misheard you, maybe you misspoke. But could you just clarify on that point? SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. You didn't mishear me, I didn't misspeak, but perhaps I spoke incompletely. You are confined by our petita insofar as that is the case that we have presented to you: the Amended Request for Arbitration and then our request for final relief. But as you proceed in your analysis, you are going to or you may very well come across issues that you consider you have to address to make your analysis work. So the petita, I think, confine the relief that you can give to us, but I don't think that the petita define the boundaries of your analysis. And if, as part of your analysis, you consider that you have to or that you should address issues because they are ancillary, because they are necessary, because otherwise the foundation for your conclusions will not be arrived at,

			1	
17.27	1		17.40 1	
17:37	1	And the clearest example is that we haven't said in our request for final relief we haven't asked you in	17:40 1	Now I suspect and I will consult with our travaux
	2	· · ·	2	guru, Laura Rees-Evans, to see whether there is any sort
	3	terms to say that Raymond Lafitte got it wrong. You may	3	of learning on these issues but that will have fed
	4	consider, as the Kishenganga Court considered, that you	4	into Professor Webb's submissions. I suspect that there
	5	may wish to say that, because that will be the clearest	5	is a very good reason why those were not subject to
	6	way of saying that the Neutral Expert in the Baglihar	6	definition, because those were intended to provide
	7	case got it wrong.	7	a degree of flexibility over time to allow best
	8	So you heard me correctly, but I just didn't	8	practices to come in. "Sound and economical design" is
	9	complete the rest of the sentence.	9	not something that you can crystallise in time; reify in
	10	THE CHAIRMAN: That's very helpful, thanks.	10	time. So that's the first point.
	11	The final question, before we talk about	11	The second point is [that] it's quite clear that it
	12	housekeeping, was: in the course of the presentations,	12	cannot just be by reference to Indian standards.
	13	including your own, it has struck me that this issue of	13	Because if it was just by reference to Indian standards,
	14	practices, best practices, has as a component: should we	14	who knows what: we may find that there is a guideline or
	15	be looking at global practices, should we be looking at	15	a standard or a regulation or a law that we are simply
	16	Indian practices? And my understanding from your	16	presented with which says, "This has just passed the
	17	presentations is: it's not sufficient to look at just	17	Parliament in Delhi, this is what the law is, this is
	18	Indian practice; we need to be looking at best practices	18	Indian law, this is the only thing that's controlling".
	19	on a broader scale.	19	This is a Treaty. This is a Treaty of a very
	20	I'm wondering whether you can say more about that in	20	special character. So that's why it cannot just be
	21	the context of dams being built in a particular area of	21	Indian standards. And indeed, I think our view would
	22	the world, the Himalayas, dams being built by	22	be and I'm sure that my Pakistani colleagues and
	23	a particular country in that area of the world.	23	those who can and will instruct me would not say that
	24	I fully understand that this is not an issue that's	24	this can just be Indian and Pakistani standards, because
	25	of interest to a single country: it is a transboundary	25	"best practices" means best practices.
		Page 261		Page 263
17:39	1	issue at a minimum. But I haven't seen yet any	17:41 1	But the reason why this point is so important, and
17:39	1 2	issue at a minimum. But I haven't seen yet any discussion of why, in this particular context, just	17:41 1	But the reason why this point is so important, and why I've put before you the formulation that we have,
17:39				
17:39	2	discussion of why, in this particular context, just	2	why I've put before you the formulation that we have,
17:39	2 3	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani	2 3	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty
17:39	2 3 4	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the	2 3 4	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said
17:39	2 3 4 5	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at	2 3 4 5	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps
17:39	2 3 4 5 6	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global	2 3 4 5 6	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices.	2 3 4 5 6 7	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so.
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site;
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam;
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning it seems like a long time ago now,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning It seems like a long time ago now, but on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant.
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the definitional paragraph, was that it gives very precise 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant. So we will return to it in more detail, but that's
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the definitional paragraph, was that it gives very precise and bespoke and special meanings to certain terms. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant. So we will return to it in more detail, but that's a preliminary response to what THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear.
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the definitional paragraph, was that it gives very precise and bespoke and special meanings to certain terms. And I think there are ten of them there, (a) through to (j). I also identified that there were some terms that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant. So we will return to it in more detail, but that's a preliminary response to what THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, I want to express my appreciation
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the definitional paragraph, was that it gives very precise and bespoke and special meanings to certain terms. And I think there are ten of them there, (a) through to (j). I also identified that there were some terms that arise in paragraph 8, for example, that were not the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant. So we will return to it in more detail, but that's a preliminary response to what THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, I want to express my appreciation for the tolerance your team has shown to my many
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the definitional paragraph, was that it gives very precise and bespoke and special meanings to certain terms. And I think there are ten of them there, (a) through to (j). I also identified that there were some terms that arise in paragraph 8, for example, that were not the subject of definition. So, for example, paragraph 2 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant. So we will return to it in more detail, but that's a preliminary response to what THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, I want to express my appreciation for the tolerance your team has shown to my many questions, including Dr Miles today. I know I tend to
17:39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the definitional paragraph, was that it gives very precise and bespoke and special meanings to certain terms. And I think there are ten of them there, (a) through to (j). I also identified that there were some terms that arise in paragraph 8, for example, that were not the subject of definition. So, for example, paragraph 2 does not provide a definition for "sound and economical 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant. So we will return to it in more detail, but that's a preliminary response to what THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, I want to express my appreciation for the tolerance your team has shown to my many questions, including Dr Miles today. I know I tend to interrupt progress. So if I can help you in a small
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning it seems like a long time ago now, but on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the definitional paragraph, was that it gives very precise and bespoke and special meanings to certain terms. And I think there are ten of them there, (a) through to (j). I also identified that there were some terms that arise in paragraph 8, for example, that were not the subject of definition. So, for example, paragraph 2 does not provide a definition for "sound and economical design" or "satisfactory operation of the works"; 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant. So we will return to it in more detail, but that's a preliminary response to what THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, I want to express my appreciation for the tolerance your team has shown to my many questions, including Dr Miles today. I know I tend to interrupt progress. So if I can help you in a small respect, I'd like to.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the definitional paragraph, was that it gives very precise and bespoke and special meanings to certain terms. And I think there are ten of them there, (a) through to (j). I also identified that there were some terms that arise in paragraph 8, for example, that were not the subject of definition. So, for example, paragraph 2 does not provide a definition for "sound and economical 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant. So we will return to it in more detail, but that's a preliminary response to what THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, I want to express my appreciation for the tolerance your team has shown to my many questions, including Dr Miles today. I know I tend to interrupt progress. So if I can help you in a small respect, I'd like to.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 discussion of why, in this particular context, just Indian practices or just maybe Indian and Pakistani practices alone are not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Treaty, as opposed to looking at more, say, regional or more important perhaps global practices. So if there's anything more you can do on that, I would be interested in it. SIR DANIEL: We will, certainly. And let me give you just an initial observation. First of all, you will recall that when I walked through the provisions of Annexure D with you, I think on Tuesday morning it seems like a long time ago now, but on Tuesday morning I took you to paragraph 2. And one of the points that I made about paragraph 2, the definitional paragraph, was that it gives very precise and bespoke and special meanings to certain terms. And I think there are ten of them there, (a) through to (j). I also identified that there were some terms that arise in paragraph 8, for example, that were not the subject of definition. So, for example, paragraph 2 does not provide a definition for "sound and economical design" or "satisfactory operation of the works"; 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 why I've put before you the formulation that we have, which is best practices in the services of the Treaty and not in circumvention thereof, is that India has said to us, or said in the Kishenganga proceedings, perhaps in the Baglihar proceedings, that Pakistan is trying to restrain India's use of best practices and it cannot be permitted to do so. We are taking India head-on on this. India is required to use best practices when it chooses the site; when it designs the dam; when it constructs the dam; when it operates the dam. It cannot have a best practice in terms of the design, and then use concrete that is just going to collapse and cause a catastrophic failure. India is required to use best practices when it comes to sound design and the operation of the plant. So we will return to it in more detail, but that's a preliminary response to what THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, I want to express my appreciation for the tolerance your team has shown to my many questions, including Dr Miles today. I know I tend to interrupt progress. So if I can help you in a small respect, I'd like to.

17:43	1 the second day that say something about the American	17:46 1	Mr Schofield, maybe initially but perhaps finally on
	2 approach to the ordinary meaning of defined terms.	2	Saturday evening with a sense of this. But perhaps no
	3 I think Professor Webb answered that question for me	3	later than, let's say, 11 o'clock on Sunday morning, so
	adequately. But if you want to reflect on those cases	4	that there is time to plan. But we will try and do that
	5 further, one is called Bond v United States, 572 US 844,	5	as quickly as possible.
	6 a 2014 decision; the other is Sackett v EPA, which is	6	At the moment, I think our sense is that there are
	598 US. It doesn't have a page number yet because it's	7	lots of thing that we would like to say, because it's
	 a 2023 decision. They both pop up on Google: they're 	8	difficult to respond to questions from the microphone.
	9 major American cases.	9	But that, at the moment, probably we would be able to do
1	0 But like I say, I think they've been adequately	10	it in one day, so it's a question of whether we will
	1 answered for my concerns.	10	need two.
	•	11	
	2 SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. That may mean that		THE CHAIRMAN: That timing I think is certainly agreeable to
	3 Professor Webb doesn't have to work over the weekend	13	the Court.
	4 becoming an expert in US law! But thank you very much	14	Once you've determined the period of time when you
	5 for that. That's very helpful.	15	would like to be presenting, I think it would be
	6 THE CHAIRMAN: I think then we are left with just a few	16	helpful, 30 minutes before that commencement, for the
	7 housekeeping issues.	17	Court to receive from you an indication of your expected
	8 So let me start this off by noting that we do	18	line-up of speakers and basic topics that they might be
	9 anticipate providing written questions to Pakistan, and	19	addressing, if that's feasible. It doesn't have to be
	0 our intention is to meet the noon deadline tomorrow that	20	particularly granular, to use a word we've been
	1 we had in mind for doing so. Some of those questions	21	invoking, but it would help give us a little bit of
2	2 perhaps even most of those questions are ones that	22	a sense of the progression as we move into that period
	3 we've already asked, but we wanted to be sure that they	23	of time.
2	4 would be on your radar screen. There may be some new	24	SIR DANIEL: We'll certainly do so.
2	5 ones that we hadn't raised. And there may be ones that	25	THE CHAIRMAN: That would be great.
	Page 265		Page 267
	1 450 200		1 460 207
17:44	1 you would like to address that we don't put on our list,	17:47 1	One thing we haven't touched upon is the possibility
17:44	5 1	17:47 1	One thing we haven't touched upon is the possibility of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag
17:44	2 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try		One thing we haven't touched upon is the possibility of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into
17:44	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your 	2	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into
17:44	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. 	2 3	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing.
17:44	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled 	2 3 4	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in
17:44	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, 	2 3 4 5 6	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the
17:44	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how 	2 3 4 5 6 7	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this
17:44	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in
1	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular
]	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might
1	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But
1	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course.
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. We will obviously reflect on what we have, questions 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can give you some initial reactions.
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. We will obviously reflect on what we have, questions from the transcript, now. You will forgive us if there 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can give you some initial reactions. First of all, I think we would find it useful,
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. We will obviously reflect on what we have, questions from the transcript, now. You will forgive us if there is a brief moment of decompression before we get sucked 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can give you some initial reactions. First of all, I think we would find it useful, because we think it would be helpful to the Court if the
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. We will obviously reflect on what we have, questions from the transcript, now. You will forgive us if there is a brief moment of decompression before we get sucked back into the mill. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can give you some initial reactions. First of all, I think we would find it useful, because we think it would be helpful to the Court if the additional documents that we produce by the intended
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. We will obviously reflect on what we have, questions from the transcript, now. You will forgive us if there is a brief moment of decompression before we get sucked back into the mill. I think what I can say for certain is that, all 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can give you some initial reactions. First of all, I think we would find it useful, because we think it would be helpful to the Court if the additional documents that we produce by the intended time of 30 September do come under cover of
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. We will obviously reflect on what we have, questions from the transcript, now. You will forgive us if there is a brief moment of decompression before we get sucked back into the mill. I think what I can say for certain is that, all other things being equal, we will certainly use Tuesday. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can give you some initial reactions. First of all, I think we would find it useful, because we think it would be helpful to the Court if the additional documents that we produce by the intended time of 30 September do come under cover of a post-hearing submission or a transmittal document;
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. We will obviously reflect on what we have, questions from the transcript, now. You will forgive us if there is a brief moment of decompression before we get sucked back into the mill. I think what I can say for certain is that, all other things being equal, we will certainly use Tuesday. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can give you some initial reactions. First of all, I think we would find it useful, because we think it would be helpful to the Court if the additional documents that we produce by the intended time of 30 September do come under cover of a post-hearing submission or a transmittal document; let's not call it a post-hearing submission because
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. We will obviously reflect on what we have, questions from the transcript, now. You will forgive us if there is a brief moment of decompression before we get sucked back into the mill. I think what I can say for certain is that, all other things being equal, we will certainly use Tuesday. The question is whether we would want to use Monday as well, and all of Monday or part of Monday. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can give you some initial reactions. First of all, I think we would find it useful, because we think it would be helpful to the Court if the additional documents that we produce by the intended time of 30 September do come under cover of a post-hearing submission or a transmittal document; let's not call it a post-hearing submission because I think we would like to be able to say to you, for your
	 and you're certainly free to do that. But we will try to give you those questions to help you organise your presentations. At present, we do have Monday and Tuesday scheduled as full days for the hearing. As you indicated, Sir Daniel, we have left it to Pakistan to decide how they want to approach it: do you want to begin at 9.30 on Monday, do you want to begin Monday afternoon instead? The question would be then: when might you be in a position to alert the Court as to your preference in that regard? And so I invite you to speak to that issue. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The short answer is that at the moment we don't know, because we'd like to wait and see your questions. We will obviously reflect on what we have, questions from the transcript, now. You will forgive us if there is a brief moment of decompression before we get sucked back into the mill. I think what I can say for certain is that, all other things being equal, we will certainly use Tuesday. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 of post-hearing submissions. So I just wanted to flag that as something that you may want to be taking into account as we move into this second part of the hearing. We certainly do have the documents still coming in on the schedule that was previously set. But the further question would be whether, at the end of this hearing, you see a need for some sort of post-hearing submission. The Court will certainly be bearing this in mind as well. If we feel that there's a particular issue that we need something more from you on, we might be in a position to alert you to that on Tuesday. But we might not: it might be something that we have to think about a bit and then come back to you in due course. SIR DANIEL: Well, as we have given it some thought, I can give you some initial reactions. First of all, I think we would find it useful, because we think it would be helpful to the Court if the additional documents that we produce by the intended time of 30 September do come under cover of a post-hearing submission or a transmittal document; let's not call it a post-hearing submission because

٦

17:49 1			
17.49 1	undertaken and if there have been any decisions that	17.51 1	course if they receive 10 documents or 100 documents -
2	undertaken, and if there have been any decisions that we've had to take about relevance.	17:51 1	course, if they receive 10 documents or 100 documents or 1,000 documents at the end of September, that they are
		2	
3	So I think regardless of any substantive	3	then given a period of time which is commensurate with
4	post-hearing submissions, I think it would be useful	4	the documents that are then produced, bearing in mind
5	that you do not just get a dump of documents but you get	5	that all of those documents given the nature of the
6	an explanation that accompanies those documents.	6	category, all of those documents will be documents that
7	On the question of whether there should be, as it	7	India has already.
8	were, real post-hearing submissions, we will obviously	8	So I suppose our proposal but I'm thinking on my
9	reflect on that, as to whether there is anything that we	9	feet here our proposal would be for two tranches: one
10	feel we've elucidated less well. But we're also going	10	
11	to be very much driven by the Court's sense.	11	then one in respect of anything else that comes in due
12	For example, just to come back to the Baglihar	12	course.
13	issue, if you wanted from us something that addressed	13	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, that's very helpful.
14	the detailed technical argument, and how the pondage	14	
15	calculation was undertaken in Baglihar, then we would	15	you'll be in contact with Mr Schofield over the weekend
16	need a little bit of time to work that up, and that	16	
17	would come in post-hearing submissions.	17	whatever that decision ends up being, you'll be
18	In this context though, I also just add for the	18	providing to us, in advance of it, a general sense of
19	Court's consideration, that you made it clear and we	19	how you anticipate the presentations to progress.
20	made it clear in the applications that we made that	20	So unless there's any other business we need to
21	India should have an opportunity to comment on the new	21	attend to, then let me just thank you for your
22	documents that we put in. And your practice after the	22	presentation and thank your entire team for their
23	competence hearing was that India was given	23	presentations throughout the week. I know it's very
24	an opportunity to comment on the documents within	24	difficult and very tiring to pull all of this together,
25	a particular period of time.	25	but you've been doing yeoman's work, and not just
	D 200		D
	Page 269		Page 271
17:50 1	Our view beyond that is that India does not have	17:53 1	advancing the positions you have but reacting to our
2	an entitlement to make a post-hearing submission as	2	questions, and we're very grateful to you for that.
3	a written pleading, because that would simply open up	3	So I hope you have a reasonably good rest of the
4	the whole written phase again, because this would be the	4	weekend, as much as that's possible, and we look forward
5	first time that we would have had anything in writing	-	
0		5	
6		5 6	to seeing you next week.
6 7	from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to	6	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court
7	from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment	6 7	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as
7 8	from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in	6 7 8	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who
7 8 9	from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial.	6 7 8 9	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us.
7 8 9 10	from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript	6 7 8 9 10	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much.
7 8 9 10 11	from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at	6 7 8 9 10	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12	from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that this should come in in two tranches. I don't recall 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that this should come in in two tranches. I don't recall precisely your direction following PO3, the competence 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that this should come in in two tranches. I don't recall precisely your direction following PO3, the competence hearing, but I think you gave India something like 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that this should come in in two tranches. I don't recall precisely your direction following PO3, the competence hearing, but I think you gave India something like two weeks to respond to the documents that were 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that this should come in in two tranches. I don't recall precisely your direction following PO3, the competence hearing, but I think you gave India something like two weeks to respond to the documents that were disclosed in the competence hearing. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that this should come in in two tranches. I don't recall precisely your direction following PO3, the competence hearing, but I think you gave India something like two weeks to respond to the documents that were disclosed in the competence hearing. And maybe there should be something like that, 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that this should come in in two tranches. I don't recall precisely your direction following PO3, the competence hearing, but I think you gave India something like two weeks to respond to the documents that were disclosed in the competence hearing. And maybe there should be something like that, requiring India to concentrate its mind on the documents 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that this should come in in two tranches. I don't recall precisely your direction following PO3, the competence hearing, but I think you gave India something like two weeks to respond to the documents that were disclosed in the competence hearing. And maybe there should be something like that, 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 from India. So insofar as India has an entitlement to comment on the documents, it's an entitlement to comment on the document, and not to all of a sudden put in a counter-memorial. Then obviously there are issues around transcript corrections and things like that, which we'll get to at the end of the hearing. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view as to when it is India would possibly be entitled to make that submission? I'm thinking that the documents may not be completely in until September 30. SIR DANIEL: It may be, for convenience and good order, that this should come in in two tranches. I don't recall precisely your direction following PO3, the competence hearing, but I think you gave India something like two weeks to respond to the documents that were disclosed in the competence hearing. And maybe there should be something like that, requiring India to concentrate its mind on the documents 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to seeing you next week. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And from us to the Court and to the Secretariat, we wish you a good weekend as well. We know there are some big events, for those who may be sports fans, on Sunday evening; sadly not for us. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you so much. (5.53 pm)

Α	142:23 187:25	243:3,7,10 244:10	203:24 239:17	185:18 209:7,9	alternatives 102:8
ab 14:12	189:13	244:13 245:10,25	advocated 98:22	250:20	although 34:13 72:24
ABDULLAH 2:12	account 2:11 19:6	247:22 248:4,20	Affairs 2:5	agreements 195:8	103:18 126:10
aberrations 49:3	25:19,20 26:17,20	249:1,8 253:6	affect 64:17 113:2	agrees 23:17 188:5	187:5 199:10
ability 13:18 25:20	41:17 162:21,23	256:20 258:1 259:3	225:23,25	Ah 55:3	246:15
27:9 37:2,3 91:24	220:6 223:19 230:5	260:16,22,25 266:1	affected 143:24 144:1	ahead 31:15 68:12	always 15:21 50:15
123:19 223:18	231:1 249:16 268:4	addressed 20:20 22:9	144:7 165:21	72:4	102:6 128:6 143:8
able 8:3 12:23,25 16:3	accounting 113:22	34:2 61:17 117:10	affects 17:12	aid 59:4	164:19 167:12
68:6 71:6,8 73:24	accumulation 158:1,3	117:15 144:11	affirmative 250:17	aim 91:12	181:23 223:10
80:25 85:3 92:10	accurate 36:4 123:7	145:20 146:7	afford 154:6	aimed 182:18 184:22	228:2
93:5 100:24 102:20	186:19	193:21 197:1	afforded 77:13	194:21 air-conditioning 10:9	AL-KHASAWNEH
104:13,18 114:1	achieve 54:24 55:23	207:10,22 215:2	afraid 43:6 90:9 122:9	0	1:10 Ambassador 2:6
116:11 136:24	117:20 achieved 24:17 38:9	223:24 228:3 233:22 235:2,3	after 1:15,18 9:15,16 21:12 47:18 64:23	Akbar 216:17 akin 190:9	ambiguity 62:10
143:2 150:22	achieves 112:2	238:20 239:25	124:21 141:11,17	alarm 142:16,18 204:5	amenable 202:16
163:14 199:3	acknowledge 174:11	241:4,8,9,10 242:23	147:12 173:5,17	204:7,13	Amended 236:8 242:
212:25 225:6	acknowledged 181:21	243:1 244:11	178:12 228:4	alarming 132:1	260:12
227:23 238:4	acknowledges 164:18	247:20 248:8 252:7	242:13 269:22	alert 266:11 268:12	American 124:19
239:19 241:14	acquire 221:3	269:13	afternoon 140:19	ALI 2:4	264:25 265:1,9
242:22 250:15	across 35:10 46:24	addresses 143:11	142:22 207:19	alia 176:15 181:16	amicable 117:21
258:1,20 267:9	202:1 206:4 259:9	182:8 225:14	266:9	allocated 141:16	amongst 184:4
268:24 above 16:3 28:1 29:8	260:15	addressing 1:17 2:4	again 20:23 22:4	allow 20:10 41:25	amount 6:19 25:4
33:3 34:14,17 40:23	act 37:6 59:1 213:24	23:23 34:16 62:25	28:12 32:19 33:16	54:23 55:23 77:11	39:16 54:8,17 55:1
73:16 74:11,19	acting 33:18	171:12 183:22	38:11 41:1 45:18	77:14 80:12 103:21	55:17 62:5 74:21,2
127:10 128:4,15	actions 67:24 68:1	200:4 201:3 220:8	47:22 50:5,22 57:20	107:8 110:23 112:5	79:13 80:3,25 81:6
132:12 146:13	active 10:10 33:22	267:19	63:22 64:10 66:9	135:13 151:6 152:6	83:1,5,15,22 84:8
147:19,21 148:13	actual 172:11 179:6	adduced 246:5,7,9	71:16 81:23 83:24	154:20 156:8	84:17,18 88:22
153:9,25 154:4,12	189:2 201:21	adequately 265:4,10	87:19 88:24 92:12	157:12,17 160:25	91:25 93:4,9 95:7
155:6 158:4 161:5	actually 1:12 32:5	adjourned 142:14	92:18,25 94:3,5,9	164:10,21 168:20	97:13 100:1 102:12
163:7,8,9,11	47:9 54:5 84:23	272:12	94:15,21 97:24	170:6 173:23 220:4	102:18,19 105:24
absence 141:5 180:13	88:8 92:13 95:12	adjudge 247:18	101:8 106:12	224:7 263:7	108:12,19 111:4
187:18 222:6	103:19 105:17	adjudicating 188:1	107:23 114:9,16	allowable 3:2 2:1,5,12	112:3,4 129:16,20
absent 33:22	108:15,20 109:8	adjudication 176:8	121:16,17 122:16	3:25 230:19	130:21 131:9
absolutely 44:6 102:5	116:24 137:24	184:13	123:22 124:12,14	allowance 26:19 133:2	132:24 133:4,13,15
115:14 140:5	139:6 141:4 186:5	adjudicative 169:7,24	124:22 127:16,23	133:5 140:23	136:17 142:2 149:1
159:21 196:14	194:18 198:22	170:7 176:25	131:17 132:19,20	allowed 153:20 159:20	153:14 155:16
213:6 219:19	208:7 220:16 240:15 242:24	178:10 183:16 184:8 186:22	133:1 136:6 137:13	allowing 24:18 132:8	157:22 160:10
231:24 243:4	256:13	adjudicator 178:5	144:7,24 153:20 154:4 155:7 156:22	allows 23:5 105:19 107:11	161:11 192:9 221:1 229:10,20,22 233:2
abstract 189:8	acute 10:3	183:18	156:25 157:3,5	alluded 20:8	254:22 259:14
abundance 198:25	ad 219:12	adjudicatory 187:23	158:8 165:2 178:1	all-embracing 198:21	amounts 24:14 154:1
abundant 49:9	adapted 6:9	adjust 142:23	178:25 182:21	almost 50:13 100:20	ample 174:2 194:21
abundantly 20:3	adapting 152:14	adjusting 231:13	203:22 210:24	150:1 188:13	amplified 22:10
231:20	add 43:23 152:7 247:3	admin 246:12	214:22 219:16	alone 132:13 176:23	analogy 97:21
abuse 173:7 232:24	269:18	administration 175:23	225:14,19 227:4,9	181:24 182:5 262:4	analysis 18:19 22:11
abusingly 181:6	added 78:21 156:12	admission 72:12	233:17,23 235:24	along 84:4 187:9	22:13 34:1 49:5
acceptable 154:5	156:14	admits 130:16	245:3 256:20 259:1	210:21 220:17	62:22 70:9 72:21
accepted 8:9 118:21 180:16	adding 131:25 246:6	adopt 188:6 199:7	259:21 260:1 270:4	224:4 226:17 229:7	122:8 128:12,19
accepting 102:21	addition 149:16	adopted 163:4 186:20	against 18:3 24:20	241:17,19 244:3	155:21 159:22
accepts 130:8	additional 30:17,18	201:2	36:17 59:10 81:5	254:25	170:23 171:1
access 109:6	34:6,24 36:15 72:12	adopting 154:5	95:10 164:2 166:2	already 2:24 20:20	196:18 230:24
accessible 180:1 224:5	73:19 74:12 79:23	adopts 126:25 130:12	181:18 237:25	22:9 30:4,5 36:22	233:24 244:15
224:7	79:25 80:5 83:8	169:9 198:15	agenda 116:5 243:16	37:6 65:3,20 66:23	248:2,3 257:16,17
accommodated	87:4 89:13,14 111:3	advance 76:25 80:17	243:17 244:24	69:16 72:23 83:10	259:22 260:14,17
218:10	112:5 121:11	114:21 271:18	251:16	90:18 109:3 117:15	260:20,21
accompanied 197:6	128:20 130:25	advanced 60:9 186:14	Agent 245:20	136:20 149:18	ancillary 238:23 241
accompanies 91:8	156:19 204:3	246:4,7,8 247:2	aggressive 187:20	164:16,23 174:9	241:13 260:22
269:6	268:20	advances 220:10	agitating 245:4	178:15 179:2,9	anew 63:17
accomplish 179:14	address 1:7 3:16 4:5	advancing 25:22,23	agitation 22:21	184:8 207:24	animus 23:18 58:8
accordance 13:25	30:22 46:6 76:13	272:1	ago 141:1 175:16	213:21 223:2	Annex 131:4
28:6 63:15 71:23	115:24 141:11	advantage 141:13	188:13 209:1	226:23 227:10	annexes 208:6
20.0 05.15 / 1.25	168:25 171:15,16	adversarial 180:14	262:14	232:7 235:22 240:2	Annexures 21:23 22:
106:25 124:17	183:5 191:22	adversaries 255:9	agree 42:6 45:5 91:19	244:24 253:14	67:10
	102.24 104.11		137:24 139:20	265:23 271:7	annual 49:3
106:25 124:17 126:23 127:7 128:5 146:2 212:23	193:24 194:11	adverse 105:25		almost tac low 154.1	another 6.5 10.6
106:25 124:17 126:23 127:7 128:5 146:2 212:23 accorded 67:5	202:6 206:6,7	advertise 253:14	agreeable 267:12	already-too-low 154:1	another 6:5 18:6
106:25 124:17 126:23 127:7 128:5 146:2 212:23 accorded 67:5 according 57:6 122:25	202:6 206:6,7 207:10 235:10	advertise 253:14 Advisor 2:5,13,14	agreeable 267:12 agreed 46:8 250:18	alright 32:22 134:10	30:16 36:12 39:6
106:25 124:17 126:23 127:7 128:5	202:6 206:6,7	advertise 253:14	agreeable 267:12		

77:21 79:6 84:12	applicability 178:8	265:2 266:8	119:21 122:3	astonishingly 105:14	197:22 198:5,15
98:23 101:8 121:4	184:12	approached 89:8	124:18 129:3,19,23	atop 160:25	201:8 204:16
125:18 127:12	applicable 14:14	approaches 101:20	176:12 182:11	attach 6:12 186:22	205:24,25 207:9
129:18 131:21	17:19 62:25 63:18	144:10	183:10 192:24	attached 186:24	203.24,23 207.9
132:1 156:1 158:6					235:6 236:5 237:5.6
	71:22 79:3 80:12 83:20 84:3 110:11	approaching 98:14,18	202:4,11 203:2,23 204:23 205:19	attaching 169:19	· · · · · ·
162:8 185:10 191:8		appropriate 169:2		181:19	237:8,11,13,21,23
205:3	169:6 194:23	175:22 184:14	211:3,15 212:21,22	attain 129:6	238:17,21 239:4,8
answer 4:9 14:1 16:6	applicant 181:13	244:13 257:1	213:10,18 214:5	attaining 54:11	239:12,18 240:5,13
16:13 17:17 29:4	186:1 188:2	appropriateness	215:18,18 216:6,6	attempt 173:11,13	240:20 241:15,23
32:20 36:20 43:6	application 1:13 72:11	183:7 184:2 185:11	217:22,22 225:13	attend 271:21	244:14,18 245:4,7,7
54:5 62:20 64:22,23	72:14 152:16	186:3	226:4 241:3 247:8	attention 20:23 85:2	245:8 248:18
71:21 100:25	187:13 193:3	approved 72:14	250:2 254:1,5,12	103:10 139:5 143:9	250:10 251:13,23
113:10 114:5 125:6	202:12 206:16	161:21	Articles 22:1 111:20	189:19 194:15	252:4,24,25,25
145:7,13,16 146:3	238:10,10 244:17	approximation 106:13	articulated 180:1	207:18 208:2,3,5,9	253:2 256:3
152:25 158:17	247:8 249:15 250:1	151:19 156:23	184:25 186:1 239:6	259:14	awards 169:21 173:2
200:25 241:15	applications 269:20	165:2	articulation 185:13	ATTILA 2:11	174:17 183:1
253:21 257:18	applied 64:19 67:18	April 35:5	232:3 240:6	attitude 117:7	199:18 200:2,2,3,3
266:15	86:2 143:23 161:22	arbitral 169:8 195:5	ASAD 2:5	Attorney 2:6	200:21,22 238:18
answered 32:18 46:7	184:15 185:5	arbitration 1:1,4 2:18	aside 23:2 201:12	attracted 197:13	238:18
138:14 152:23	233:11 239:12,20	176:14 193:8	asked 138:13 143:11	attraction 187:5	aware 21:17 34:22
265:3,11	250:19	194:19 203:6,11,21	161:18 176:2	August 22:14 117:8	38:6 103:11 129:22
answering 23:3	applies 109:21 119:2	205:11,13,23 228:8	188:15 198:23	228:6	130:17 166:25
135:17 145:12	150:9	228:17 236:9 242:7	218:5 224:21 229:1	authentic 231:10	197:16,25 199:6
anticipate 64:18 197:8	apply 145:10 147:10	260:13	241:18 243:2.6,9	authoritative 117:24	200:20 201:1
237:9 242:18 252:4	147:24 161:9	archives 258:8	244:6 261:2 265:23	202:16	238:15
265:19 271:19	176:22 187:2	area 121:22 261:21,23	asking 15:15 171:11	authority 189:1 210:9	away 70:25 89:9 100:3
anticipated 18:3 142:6	221:14 235:14	areas 144:11 148:1	171:17 180:7,9	210:10 221:16	102:2 110:7 139:25
171:7 172:18	applying 89:20 105:18		-		205:5 227:22 231:8
		arguably 100:16	181:2 188:8,9	AutoCAD 151:17	
175:15 193:23	145:16 243:25	argue 75:17 113:21	190:13 191:2	auxiliary 149:3	AWN 1:10
194:3 230:2	appointed 210:9,11	114:9	193:25 196:14,15	164:24	axis 17:4 163:19
anticipates 62:24	242:1	argued 117:3 181:12	196:19 197:7	availability 35:22	A-something 199:23
anticipating 56:22	appointing 210:8,10	arguendo 144:3	247:22 248:3 249:1	176:7,10 227:14	A15 199:11
198:9	appreciate 3:7 38:14	argument 43:17 44:5	249:8	available 24:13 27:9	A15(II.A) 199:12
anticipation 193:22	39:8 103:1	69:15 103:3 141:6	asks 118:12 143:22,25	35:2 46:15 49:15,19	A3 206:12
anticipatory 251:15	appreciated 10:1	145:21 169:19	144:5 174:24	53:10 56:11 60:6	
anti-storage 25:9	37:13	197:21,22 210:19	Aslam 173:18	64:8 68:10 73:22	<u> </u>
anyone 52:10 192:18	appreciation 20:10	216:1 269:14	aspect 36:12 171:13	79:8,9,14,22 84:6	b 3:25 40:13 84:15
anything 41:4 55:18	108:18 149:22	arguments 45:17	238:18 248:16	89:16 105:11	86:11 143:4 145:12
92:1 97:15 136:19	190:19 222:15	101.01 027.14 15	aspects 116:14 186:19	112:16 127:15	
141:22 202:6		181:21 237:14,15	-		213:25 241:16
	223:5 234:25	238:2	193:11 203:23	130:18 136:24	213:25 241:16 247:16 248:11
234:15 238:12			-		
	223:5 234:25	238:2	193:11 203:23	130:18 136:24	247:16 248:11 251:17
234:15 238:12	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7 17:16 20:3,16,19
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7 17:16 20:3,16,19 25:16 27:14 28:12
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7 17:16 20:3,16,19 25:16 27:14 28:12 37:13 38:22 51:7
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7 17:16 20:3,16,19 25:16 27:14 28:12 37:13 38:22 51:7 57:9 72:4,9 75:9
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensions 36:13	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7 17:16 20:3,16,19 25:16 27:14 28:12 37:13 38:22 51:7 57:9 72:4,9 75:9 81:19 85:20,24 96:4
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensions 36:13 apprehensive 34:25	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7 17:16 20:3,16,19 25:16 27:14 28:12 37:13 38:22 51:7 57:9 72:4,9 75:9 81:19 85:20,24 96:4 96:8,18 97:16
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensions 36:13 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7 17:16 20:3,16,19 25:16 27:14 28:12 37:13 38:22 51:7 57:9 72:4,9 75:9 81:19 85:20,24 96:4 96:8,18 97:16 100:24 104:5 107:9
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7 17:16 20:3,16,19 25:16 27:14 28:12 37:13 38:22 51:7 57:9 72:4,9 75:9 81:19 85:20,24 96:4 96:8,18 97:16 100:24 104:5 107:9 108:10 109:16
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensions 36:13 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25	247:16 248:11 251:17 back 1:3 14:21 16:7 17:16 20:3,16,19 25:16 27:14 28:12 37:13 38:22 51:7 57:9 72:4,9 75:9 81:19 85:20,24 96:4 96:8,18 97:16 100:24 104:5 107:9 108:10 109:16 136:6 137:12,13
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensions 36:13 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \textbf{back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \textbf{back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \textbf{back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologise 42:5 243:12 apologise 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24 136:25 145:9,11,15	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologise 42:5 243:12 apologise 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24 136:25 145:9,11,15 145:16,19 152:24	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assumed 51:15	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologise 42:5 243:12 apologise 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24 136:25 145:9,11,15 145:16,19 152:24 155:2 160:3 161:9	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assumed 51:15 assumes 71:22 74:4	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologise 42:5 243:12 apologise 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5 appendices 208:7	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24 136:25 145:9,111,15 145:16,19 152:24 155:2 160:3 161:9 162:9 168:14,24	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24 arriving 82:6	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assumed 51:15 assumes 71:22 74:4 113:25	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18 172:21 173:1,9,14	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 200:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ 224:23\ 227:9\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5 appendices 208:7 appendix 22:12,16	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensions 36:13 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24 136:25 145:9,11,15 145:16,19 152:24 155:2 160:3 161:9 162:9 168:14,24 169:12 171:11	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24 arriving 82:6 Arshad 10:19	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assigned 31:6,9,20 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assumed 51:15 assumes 71:22 74:4 113:25 assuming 15:18 50:24	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18 172:21 173:1,9,14 174:6,17 175:2,6,12	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ 224:23\ 227:9\\ 228:25\ 230:22\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5 appendices 208:7 appendix 22:12,16 47:13,17 48:1,1	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensions 36:13 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24 136:25 145:9,11,15 145:16,19 152:24 155:2 160:3 161:9 162:9 168:14,24 169:12 171:11 175:21 188:6,8	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24 arriving 82:6 Arshad 10:19 Article 1:1 20:19,21	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assumed 51:15 assumed 51	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18 172:21 173:1,9,14 174:6,17 175:2,6,12 176:17 177:15	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ 224:23\ 227:9\\ 228:25\ 230:22\\ 232:8,11,15,20\end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5 appendix 22:12,16 47:13,17 48:1,1 61:22 66:13,25	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24 136:25 145:9,11,15 145:16,19 152:24 155:2 160:3 161:9 162:9 168:14,24 169:12 171:11 175:21 188:6,8 190:22 192:7 198:8	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24 arriving 82:6 Arshad 10:19 Article 1:1 20:19,21 20:24 21:14,18,21	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assumed 51:15 assumed	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18 172:21 173:1,9,14 174:6,17 175:2,6,12 176:17 177:15 178:10,21 179:14	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ 224:23\ 227:9\\ 228:25\ 230:22\\ 232:8,11,15,20\\ 233:19,23\ 235:9\end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologise 42:5 243:12 apologise 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5 appendices 208:7 appendix 22:12,16 47:13,17 48:1,1 61:22 66:13,25 81:15 85:2 89:19	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensions 36:13 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24 136:25 145:9,11,15 145:16,19 152:24 155:2 160:3 161:9 162:9 168:14,24 169:12 171:11 175:21 188:6,8 190:22 192:7 198:8 198:11,16 199:8	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24 arriving 82:6 Arshad 10:19 Article 1:1 20:19,21 20:24 21:14,18,21 21:22 22:1,10 23:18	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assume 51:15 assume 51:15 assume 51:15 assume 51:15 assume 15:18 50:24 99:15 104:15 126:1 128:6 132:9 144:2,7 166:13	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18 172:21 173:1,9,14 174:6,17 175:2,6,12 176:17 177:15 178:10,21 179:14 179:21 182:8 183:1	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ 224:23\ 227:9\\ 228:25\ 230:22\\ 232:8,11,15,20\\ 233:19,23\ 235:9\\ 236:6,25\ 238:25\\ \hline \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologise 42:5 243:12 apologise 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5 appendice 208:7 appendix 22:12,16 47:13,17 48:1,1 61:22 66:13,25 81:15 85:2 89:19 90:7 91:2,3,5	$\begin{array}{c} 223:5\ 234:25\\ 236:21\ 237:7,16\\ 258:14,14\ 264:20\\ \textbf{appreciations\ }208:20\\ 209:15,15\ 210:1,5\\ 210:14,15\\ \textbf{apprehensive\ }36:13\\ \textbf{apprehensive\ }34:25\\ \textbf{approach\ }3:3,24\ 4:1,5\\ 19:9,12\ 42:8\ 57:9\\ 62:4\ 70:16\ 99:5\\ 100:14\ 111:14\\ 112:11\ 116:21,23\\ 116:25\ 117:3,12,24\\ 118:15,19\ 119:1,10\\ 122:6\ 127:1\ 130:18\\ 134:1,11,13,24\\ 136:25\ 145:9,11,15\\ 145:16,19\ 152:24\\ 155:2\ 160:3\ 161:9\\ 162:9\ 168:14,24\\ 169:12\ 171:11\\ 175:21\ 188:6,8\\ 190:22\ 192:7\ 198:8\\ 198:11,16\ 199:8\\ 209:19\ 219:5\ 223:6\\ \end{array}$	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24 arriying 82:6 Arshad 10:19 Article 1:1 20:19,21 20:24 21:14,18,21 21:22 22:1,10 23:18 24:25 27:11 34:23	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assume 51:15 assumes 71:22 74:4 113:25 assuming 15:18 50:24 99:15 104:15 126:1 128:6 132:9 144:2,7 166:13 assumption 75:25	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18 172:21 173:1,9,14 174:6,17 175:2,6,12 176:17 177:15 178:10,21 179:14 179:21 182:8 183:1 183:12 184:3,14,24	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ 224:23\ 227:9\\ 228:25\ 230:22\\ 232:8,11,15,20\\ 233:19,23\ 235:9\\ 236:6,25\ 238:25\\ 239:16\ 243:13,23\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5 appendices 208:7 appendix 22:12,16 47:13,17 48:1,1 61:22 66:13,25 81:15 85:2 89:19 90:7 91:2,3,5 103:10 110:20	$\begin{array}{c} 223:5\ 234:25\\ 236:21\ 237:7,16\\ 258:14,14\ 264:20\\ \textbf{appreciations\ }208:20\\ 209:15,15\ 210:1,5\\ 210:14,15\\ \textbf{apprehensive\ }34:25\\ \textbf{apprehensive\ }34:25\\ \textbf{approach\ }3:3,24\ 4:1,5\\ 19:9,12\ 42:8\ 57:9\\ 62:4\ 70:16\ 99:5\\ 100:14\ 111:14\\ 112:11\ 116:21,23\\ 116:25\ 117:3,12,24\\ 118:15,19\ 119:1,10\\ 122:6\ 127:1\ 130:18\\ 134:1,11,13,24\\ 136:25\ 145:9,11,15\\ 145:16,19\ 152:24\\ 155:2\ 160:3\ 161:9\\ 162:9\ 168:14,24\\ 169:12\ 171:11\\ 175:21\ 188:6,8\\ 190:22\ 192:7\ 198:8\\ 198:11,16\ 199:8\\ 209:19\ 219:5\ 223:6\\ 230:15,16\ 231:5,10\\ \end{array}$	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24 arriyng 82:6 Arshad 10:19 Article 1:1 20:19,21 20:24 21:14,18,21 21:22 22:1,10 23:18 24:25 27:11 34:23 36:23 37:16 41:9,24	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assume 51:15 assumes 71:22 74:4 113:25 assumes 71:22 74:4 113:25 assuming 15:18 50:24 99:15 104:15 126:1 128:6 132:9 144:2,7 166:13 assumption 75:25 125:21 128:14	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18 172:21 173:1,9,14 174:6,17 175:2,6,12 176:17 177:15 178:10,21 179:14 179:21 182:8 183:1 183:12 184:3,14,24 186:2 188:4 189:8	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ 224:23\ 227:9\\ 228:25\ 230:22\\ 238:11,15,20\\ 233:19,23\ 235:9\\ 236:6,25\ 238:25\\ 239:16\ 243:13,23\\ 244:2\ 245:9\ 252:10\\ \hline \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5 appendices 208:7 appendix 22:12,16 47:13,17 48:1,1 61:22 66:13,25 81:15 85:2 89:19 90:7 91:23,5 103:10 110:20 135:6 136:22 138:5	223:5 234:25 236:21 237:7,16 258:14,14 264:20 appreciations 208:20 209:15,15 210:1,5 210:14,15 apprehensive 34:25 approach 3:3,24 4:1,5 19:9,12 42:8 57:9 62:4 70:16 99:5 100:14 111:14 112:11 116:21,23 116:25 117:3,12,24 118:15,19 119:1,10 122:6 127:1 130:18 134:1,11,13,24 136:25 145:9,11,15 145:16,19 152:24 155:2 160:3 161:9 162:9 168:14,24 169:12 171:11 175:21 188:6,8 190:22 192:7 198:8 198:11,16 199:8 209:19 219:5 223:6 230:15,16 231:5,10 232:23 233:25	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24 arriving 82:6 Arshad 10:19 Article 1:1 20:19,21 20:24 21:14,18,21 21:22 22:1,10 23:18 24:25 27:11 34:23 36:23 37:16 41:9,24 44:10 58:7 65:13,17	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assume 51:15 assumes 71:22 74:4 113:25 assuming 15:18 50:24 99:15 104:15 126:1 128:6 132:9 144:2,7 166:13 assumption 75:25 125:21 128:14 140:5 181:16	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18 172:21 173:1,9,14 174:6,17 177:15 178:10,21 179:14 179:21 182:8 183:1 183:12 184:3,14,24 186:2 188:4 189:8 189:15 194:11,25	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ 224:23\ 227:9\\ 228:25\ 230:22\\ 232:8,11,15,20\\ 233:19,23\ 235:9\\ 236:6,25\ 238:25\\ 239:16\ 243:13,23\\ 244:2\ 245:9\ 252:10\\ 252:17\ 253:8\ 255:7\\ \end{array}$
234:15 238:12 246:24 258:9,10 262:8 269:9 270:5 271:11 anyway 148:3 anywhere 56:19 apart 219:25 232:13 apex 90:1 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 42:5 243:12 apologies 44:25 47:22 apparent 63:6 appear 67:3 131:4 174:22 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearing 168:21 237:19 appears 123:11 126:16 160:20 257:5 appendices 208:7 appendix 22:12,16 47:13,17 48:1,1 61:22 66:13,25 81:15 85:2 89:19 90:7 91:2,3,5 103:10 110:20	$\begin{array}{c} 223:5\ 234:25\\ 236:21\ 237:7,16\\ 258:14,14\ 264:20\\ \textbf{appreciations\ }208:20\\ 209:15,15\ 210:1,5\\ 210:14,15\\ \textbf{apprehensive\ }34:25\\ \textbf{apprehensive\ }34:25\\ \textbf{approach\ }3:3,24\ 4:1,5\\ 19:9,12\ 42:8\ 57:9\\ 62:4\ 70:16\ 99:5\\ 100:14\ 111:14\\ 112:11\ 116:21,23\\ 116:25\ 117:3,12,24\\ 118:15,19\ 119:1,10\\ 122:6\ 127:1\ 130:18\\ 134:1,11,13,24\\ 136:25\ 145:9,11,15\\ 145:16,19\ 152:24\\ 155:2\ 160:3\ 161:9\\ 162:9\ 168:14,24\\ 169:12\ 171:11\\ 175:21\ 188:6,8\\ 190:22\ 192:7\ 198:8\\ 198:11,16\ 199:8\\ 209:19\ 219:5\ 223:6\\ 230:15,16\ 231:5,10\\ \end{array}$	238:2 arise 172:3 178:19,25 179:4 185:25 236:3 262:21 arises 47:20 132:1 198:17 212:4 arising 29:22 30:1 65:24 141:14 182:6 188:1 193:2 195:3 215:21 271:10 Arms 187:11 Army 9:5 11:15 52:17 around 14:10 74:18 104:11 108:1 133:3 149:4 158:6 199:1 211:14 228:17 229:23 270:10 arrangement 221:23 arrival 188:18 arrived 260:24 arriyng 82:6 Arshad 10:19 Article 1:1 20:19,21 20:24 21:14,18,21 21:22 22:1,10 23:18 24:25 27:11 34:23 36:23 37:16 41:9,24	193:11 203:23 204:18 214:24 237:21 Assembly 188:12 assessed 183:17 258:24 assessing 257:15 assessment 259:3 assigned 31:6,9,20 assist 9:11 assistance 74:24 83:16 83:24 194:17 Assistant 2:20 associated 11:21 75:20 assume 78:4 81:23 99:24 125:19,22 128:1,2 210:6 assume 51:15 assumes 71:22 74:4 113:25 assumes 71:22 74:4 113:25 assuming 15:18 50:24 99:15 104:15 126:1 128:6 132:9 144:2,7 166:13 assumption 75:25 125:21 128:14	130:18 136:24 195:18 226:12 average 46:19 47:1 48:11,12 55:9 75:23 76:3 averaged 46:24 76:9 113:1 averages 47:3,4 averaging 55:17 112:24 avoid 60:19 189:3 197:8 198:23,25 201:16 244:19 avoided 123:23 avoiding 112:18 186:6 avowedly 118:7 200:4 await 26:5 award 23:8 58:9 67:22 136:8 154:23 156:3 169:4,8 171:18 172:21 173:1,9,14 174:6,17 175:2,6,12 176:17 177:15 178:10,21 179:14 179:21 182:8 183:1 183:12 184:3,14,24 186:2 188:4 189:8	$\begin{array}{c} 247:16\ 248:11\\ 251:17\\ \hline {\bf back}\ 1:3\ 14:21\ 16:7\\ 17:16\ 20:3,16,19\\ 25:16\ 27:14\ 28:12\\ 37:13\ 38:22\ 51:7\\ 57:9\ 72:4,9\ 75:9\\ 81:19\ 85:20,24\ 96:4\\ 96:8,18\ 97:16\\ 100:24\ 104:5\ 107:9\\ 108:10\ 109:16\\ 136:6\ 137:12,13\\ 138:22\ 140:14,17\\ 141:11\ 142:22,24\\ 158:22\ 161:2\\ 195:19\ 196:8\\ 202:18\ 204:22\\ 205:1,3\ 206:18\\ 211:12\ 215:2\ 216:3\\ 218:20\ 222:17,22\\ 224:23\ 227:9\\ 228:25\ 230:22\\ 238:11,15,20\\ 233:19,23\ 235:9\\ 236:6,25\ 238:25\\ 239:16\ 243:13,23\\ 244:2\ 245:9\ 252:10\\ \hline \end{array}$

					[]
266:20,25 268:14	121:7,9 186:19	17:3,4,9 29:14	248:24 250:1	26:15 35:15 109:19	168:1 200:3 221:5,6
269:12	254:2 256:5 267:18	56:13,24 60:12,14	beyond 41:25 65:9	115:23 205:14	Buildings 2:10,11
backdrop 171:22	basically 30:24 43:15	60:17 65:22 68:9	66:11 84:17 89:12	210:22 211:5	built 105:20 147:16
background 22:25	100:6 153:13	70:1 74:18 75:25	176:8 180:2 203:12	216:14 227:2	150:4 153:4 163:22
95:10	193:24 256:8	80:2,10 86:13,24,25	207:21 236:2	244:15 253:9 265:8	167:18,22 224:7
backroom 233:5	basins 65:21,22	87:12,14,16,19 88:4	238:20 239:5 242:3	bottom 12:12 17:3	261:21,22
backstop 259:16	basis 8:14 32:2 41:7	88:5 110:23 117:24	242:8 270:1	34:17 87:21 150:1	Bureau 155:23
bad 132:13 154:13	65:7 66:16 68:25	164:15 177:21	big 157:5 244:25	152:4 154:15	buried 211:9
237:18	76:16,25 113:13	178:9 228:10 237:2	245:5 250:11 252:5	157:11 164:17,20	BURKI 2:5
Baglihar 56:9 117:4	114:18,20 127:13	252:9 261:21,22	272:8	252:24	business 107:14
117:11,12,18,24	130:14 135:12	266:22 271:17	bigger 148:8 214:25	bound 201:7 221:24	271:20
118:19,23 119:3	148:7 155:4 177:3	believe 47:23,23 72:12	biggest 152:3 157:11	222:1 236:12	busy 140:19
125:1,23 126:23	181:25 197:23	76:4,7 95:5 166:21	167:22	boundaries 111:23	Buytaert 1:12 26:7,8
127:10,23,24	217:23 221:13	believes 189:6	binding 117:14,18	170:13 175:18	26:9,22 38:20,21
131:18,22,24 132:2	224:9 229:4 233:24	below 5:22 40:1,20	118:16 175:6	260:20	39:4 53:16,17,20
132:7,11,12 133:8	239:23 240:18	48:22 58:2 74:19,20	177:17,24 179:1	boundary 163:18	54:2 55:2,4,21 75:6
139:10 143:24	259:18	77:4 80:19 82:25	180:2 182:20	171:4	75:8 76:15 90:3,4
145:11 147:14	battery 72:25,25 77:9	83:5,21 86:19 89:5	184:25 190:19	bounds 181:15 242:3	90:12,22,25 91:2,6
152:24 153:1,5,11	battlefield 103:3	95:3 102:15 104:23	197:21 202:16	braces 198:24	91:8,11 92:5,21
154:6 161:22 162:3	bear 3:6 129:21	109:4 110:25 128:4	221:25 248:6	Brant 177:13	93:18 94:11,25
162:25 167:13	172:10 174:10	128:15 144:19,25	bit 3:1,7 11:24 25:14	brave 228:16	95:16,20 96:13
172:10 222:12	193:11 197:19	146:19 150:5 152:4	40:10 42:13 47:8	breach 151:10 188:15	102:22 103:9
223:5 224:24 227:2	bearing 77:8 116:16	154:1,11,21 155:6	51:8 70:8 76:12	breaching 29:15 149:2	104:12 108:8,9
236:21 242:21,24	268:9 271:4	156:8,13 157:12	78:2 90:5 93:13,13	break 1:21 16:7 70:4	109:15 110:3 113:4
261:6 264:6 269:12	bears 131:17	160:12 164:3,22	93:19 94:22 99:7	70:24,25 71:14 72:3	113:5,21 114:9,24
269:15	beast 147:4	belt 198:24	100:21 102:25	72:4,7,20 73:9	115:3,14 132:22,23
Bahrain 170:17	became 35:25	beneath 28:16	115:19 140:23	137:12 140:17,24	134:5 135:1 137:8
balance 18:2 24:17	become 68:17 115:20	benefit 89:13 222:1	142:20,21 143:2	195:13,17,22	137:11,17 138:1
36:17,22 81:12 84:7	137:21,22 228:22	224:11	159:12 192:21	breakdown 104:6	139:4,18 140:5
86:24 107:21	251:21	benefits 111:11	193:1 197:4 198:9	breaking 42:13	158:20,21,22
118:10 173:22	becomes 35:11 40:10	bespoke 262:18	199:5 200:10,11,14	brewing 250:12	159:25 167:16,17
178:17,18 213:11	45:24 82:15 125:7	best 32:19 45:1 69:25	201:10 207:12	brief 145:8,14 190:8	168:6 218:4 224:21
213:14,15 214:14	132:16 187:19	130:18 157:18	210:21 211:12,24	196:13 201:11	B-something 199:23
215:17 216:9 217:6	231:19	203:18 204:19	213:5 214:15	207:4 210:17	B1 199:10
218:1,9,12,14,14,22	becoming 265:14	233:20 243:10	216:10,12 217:18	228:23 266:19	B61 199:10
218:25 219:2	bedazzled 211:25	249:2,5,10,11	217:19 218:6	briefly 3:11 46:6	
balancing 36:21 37:6	before 1:9 3:10 11:3	261:14,18 263:7,25	220:23 224:5,7	168:25 207:13	C
81:3 214:4	14:18 32:21 35:25	263:25 264:3,7,10	231:13 240:10,10	213:19 227:10	c 84:15 86:13 123:11
bank 76:11 81:12	38:21 39:5 43:6,10	264:12,15	240:14 246:2	bring 90:9,12,22	167:25 241:16
209:7 215:25	45:11 48:10 52:2	Bethlehem 2:9 4:10,13	254:10 255:17	137:13 210:14	242:14 248:12
218:17 228:11	57:13 60:7 63:17	betrays 129:1	256:24 257:9,22,25	bringing 255:9,10	cadence 232:13
banked 133:14 Bank's 217:8	71:14 72:3,10 73:9 79:17 89:8 96:18	better 9:10 47:9 92:23 104:11,14 147:14	260:3 267:21 268:14 269:16	brings 13:19 141:10	cajoled 209:6
bargain 214:25 215:7		152:17 156:13	bits 71:14	216:13 219:24 221:9 236:25	calculate 64:15 70:12
0	143:7 168:21,23	168:2	Blackmore 1:11 14:17	Briscoe 35:14,24 36:4	99:13 110:18
215:11,16,17,21,25 216:1,4,5,6,7,8	171:7,22 173:18 179:2,19 186:17	between 1:15 12:15	14:18 15:12,16 16:8	118:7	124:25 161:16
217:19,21,22,22,23	188:5,12 189:17	24:15,17 28:10,19	16:18 17:6,11,15	broad 10:2 144:11	calculated 24:3 46:20
217.19,21,22,22,23 218:17,24,24,25	191:21,23 192:2,5	44:1 45:20 46:8	32:8,9,17 227:21	180:17 185:16	49:2 51:25 65:10
219:17,17,17 222:3	191.21,23 192.2,3	52:7,9 60:20 61:12	Blackmore's 67:2	broader 63:1 171:23	68:4 89:22 96:19
222:5 247:24	200:5 204:13	62:11 64:14 70:21	blast 6:4	172:5 198:1 203:12	119:12 120:6
bargains 215:1,15	205:16 207:25	72:13 74:15 88:15	blessed 153:18	205:10,15,21	123:14 127:12
219:2,16 247:20,23	224:14 225:10	96:7,16,23 97:7	BLINK 2:21	250:15,16 261:19	128:11 148:5 256:7 calculating 2:11 50:7
barred 186:25	238:8 243:18	98:1 101:15 104:17	blinking 149:25 156:1	broadly 9:21 69:23	51:19 77:18
base 124:22 186:12	248:11,12,14	114:6 117:6 124:1	blowing 207:1	104:11 119:6 154:5	calculation 3:1 2:1,4
based 20:10 39:18	251:13 261:11	129:2 136:13	blown 118:3 216:16	broken 46:18 225:10	3:3,24 4:6,10 16:9
47:11 66:15 70:13	264:2 266:19	137:19 144:10	blueprint 177:10	brought 101:22	16:17 17:19 36:7
82:1 92:18 96:19,20	267:16	147:21 163:19	blunt 117:25	193:11 244:10	42:8 43:12,21 44:22
97:3,3,5 113:18	beforehand 97:10	170:17,18 171:4	board 193:16	Brownlie 183:22	48:1 51:9 57:2,23
125:1,9 126:1 130:9	begin 266:8,9	173:24 174:1,12	bodies 187:24 188:25	BRYCE 2:20	57:25 58:25 59:11
134:25 135:24	beginning 224:24	177:25 178:17	248:7	BR-8 56:9	59:20 60:4,13,21
147:7 181:5,18	begins 63:17 120:4	180:4 181:8 182:9	body 226:19 242:13	build 7:3 18:7,9	64:18 66:16 67:18
229:5 232:9,21	226:16	182:20 185:2	Boiled 129:14	133:18 151:11	68:10,15,22 69:11
237:6 253:20	behalf 168:22	187:16 189:12	Bond 265:5	158:16 165:19	70:19,20,23 71:4,18
baseload 10:21 11:9	behaviour 9:17	193:2 195:8 199:17	book 116:22	166:14,20 214:11	71:18 74:3,7 81:16
11:17 12:10,17 13:7	behind 48:25 104:4	208:16,23 209:13	bore 232:25	220:18 221:1 223:7	93:20,24 95:2 96:17
104:6,15,16	139:2	209:14,20 215:17	borrow 255:3	229:8,9	98:19 101:16 108:1
basic 6:8 10:9,16	being 6:6 10:10 12:17	215:18 218:10,25	Bosnian 169:8	building 3:9 70:10	108:13,23 112:18
11:14 52:15 56:3	12:22 13:1 14:9	219:3 231:4 243:8	both 6:23 17:25 22:5	85:9 133:20,20,20	112:24 113:13

					111day, 12 July 2021
115:6 117:1,9,19	carefully 11:12 109:24	certainly 25:10 48:6	chose 35:20	175:25 207:19	260:15 263:8
118:14 123:9 125:4	116:9 160:15	126:8 139:16	chosen 19:20 165:13	208:3,8,25	266:25 268:14,21
126:13 127:4 131:1	189:14 222:15	140:16 142:1 167:5	174:21	closely 119:24 171:14	269:12,17 270:18
132:2 133:3 135:23	carried 73:8	167:5,13,24 188:8	circle 205:9,11	199:11 237:3	comes 7:9 21:12 96:8
136:23 138:18	carry 45:13 59:3 68:6	193:19,21 217:10	circuitous 42:5	closer 131:13	113:11 199:9 200:5
139:22 140:6 223:6	case 1:3 2:21 1:10	227:2 228:4 230:12	circumstance 82:3	closes 69:15 116:22	200:18 216:8
229:4 230:11,18,21	5:19 13:3 17:9,21	245:12 247:25	159:19 204:21	closing 77:5 139:6	218:20 220:8,12
232:21 233:9,19	32:6 35:3 49:4 58:5	250:6 255:14 257:1	211:8 215:23	171:16 189:21	221:4 223:15
269:15	64:13 74:22,23	262:10 266:2,22	236:18 237:19	206:24 207:2	227:22,24 233:12
calculations 47:19	85:24 88:17 94:14	267:12,24 268:5,9	circumstances 40:18	210:25	235:9 237:20 239:8
60:12 68:13 81:14	94:17 95:25 101:16	certainty 76:24 175:5	69:16 181:9 182:7	cloth 195:18 206:25	240:13,22 250:15
82:17 90:13 91:8,12	113:11 119:3	250:17,20	185:12 186:7 187:4	clues 65:9	264:16 271:11
91:18,20 94:18	121:21,24 127:19	Cessation 187:11	217:3 220:1 226:8	coated 156:17	comfort 201:6 268:25
109:9 119:18 130:6	131:14 151:9	cetera 42:21 249:16	235:3 239:12	coating 220:13 221:2	comfortably 141:8
138:7,11,16,19,25	159:10 167:5	Chair 55:1 72:19	240:16	coatings 227:15	coming 55:18 108:9
140:4,8 256:13,17	169:14 171:3,4	101:4,17 134:7	circumvent 249:6	cocktail 28:13	147:12,20 158:22
calculator 60:16	172:15,21 174:11	142:11	circumvention 243:11	coffee 1:21 16:7 70:4	199:18 218:17
calculators 60:8	177:20 180:19	Chairman's 243:24	264:4	70:24 72:4,20	222:20 228:25
calculus 256:20	181:8,10 182:8	255:25	cite 258:9	195:13	235:4 240:1 245:22
Caldeira 177:13	183:21 184:20	challenge 205:2 237:5	civil 124:19 258:3	cognate 20:12	268:5
calibrated 235:18	185:14 186:7 187:2	challenges 174:5,6	claim 130:3 181:16,23	cognisant 38:18	comity 240:7,15
call 8:24 11:5 91:1	187:4 192:7 194:15	224:15 227:20,25	182:24	coheres 69:25	command 154:17
97:17 133:2 189:20	196:15 199:21	228:2,3 250:22	claimant 185:23	coincides 102:10	commandment 150:9
190:7,23 268:23	200:1 203:10,15	252:16	claimed 176:19	collapse 264:14	commenced 173:17
called 8:7,10 44:23	207:20 208:8 209:2	challenging 19:19	claims 174:20 181:3,5	colleague 1:12	commencement
154:3 178:1 182:22	222:10,12,12,15,20	chance 76:14	181:17 182:6	colleagues 15:22	119:13 267:16
190:15 227:17 265:5	236:13,21,24 237:1	change 19:11 65:15 130:23 137:19,21	191:25 192:3,4	31:13 53:25 57:21	commend 208:3,9
calling 93:16 94:9	237:7,7 238:6,11 239:18 240:25	140:3 152:3 157:11	199:7,13 200:18,20 202:1	76:14 96:12 109:13 189:24 207:15	commends 59:9 commensurate 271:3
97:14 100:16	245:16 251:3 258:8	158:11 214:2,9	clarification 14:20	245:13 253:19	comment 76:7 137:17
came 22:19 127:22	260:12 261:7	220:6 229:18	26:4 38:23 100:25	263:22	137:23 269:21,24
194:18 196:12	cases 104:15 147:2	233:18	172:22 243:21	collecting 82:9 148:20	270:7,7
254:25 258:18	170:3,19 192:2	changed 156:7 199:20	clarify 25:13 53:8	College 210:9	commented 23:2
CAMERON 2:10	194:10 197:17	changes 30:1 56:17	115:4 140:25	colloguy 96:15	comments 137:5
Cameroon 171:5	199:7,10,18,22,22	113:14,22 114:2,13	174:25 260:8	Colombia 169:14	227:1
Cameroons 178:4	199:24 232:15	154:24 221:19	clarity 175:1 179:18	colossal 6:14 131:9	Commission 117:21
184:4,18	242:1 264:25 265:4	changing 199:20	189:16 250:17	column 86:11,13,15	132:20 192:3
canal 148:20	265:9	220:5	clause 39:21 40:13	86:17	200:20 221:16
candidates 63:18	case-specific 169:12	channel 211:13	clear 3:19 20:3,16	combination 142:19	222:13 226:18,18
candidly 233:15	177:3	chapeau 2:16 39:12	21:11 31:25 41:22	176:2	Commissioner 2:4
canons 183:20 188:10	cast 66:7	39:22 40:13 44:18	64:13,17 71:22	combine 164:12	34:4 139:8,11
capability 90:11	casts 119:23	143:15 246:25	93:21,23 100:10	combined 150:17	225:11
capable 14:9 49:18	cat 97:23,23	chapter 36:3 208:2,8	112:12 115:15,16	156:17 183:9	Commissioners 72:13
52:19 54:11 60:14	catastrophic 264:14	208:10 247:21	118:18 125:7	come 11:2 37:1,15	117:6
60:17 68:9 88:4	category 56:4 183:24	248:8	143:15 151:8	39:5 45:1 46:3 65:1	Commissioner's
180:25 capacity 5:16 6:3,18	271:6 caught 166:6	character 67:11 243:3 247:19,22 263:20	152:19 156:4	72:4 91:14 93:21 98:7 100:24 113:20	224:16 commissions 200:19
7:7 8:6 10:23 15:2,8	cause 15:1 165:20	characterisation 97:9	159:16 172:13,17 173:11 182:13	98:7 100:24 113:20 114:3 140:17 143:7	commitment 221:25
15:24 16:4,16 18:2	225:18,21 226:3,9	236:23	185:7 195:17 205:7	149:20 164:1 175:9	committed 228:25
25:3 28:10 42:25	264:14	characterising 206:14	209:18 225:16	192:23 193:22	Committee 188:12
50:1 54:13,16 57:6	caused 110:12 111:24	characteristically	231:20,24 242:13	195:19 196:8	common 2:16 53:22
58:3 77:22,24 96:2	124:8	49:6	249:9 256:19	197:15 200:7 202:5	53:25 249:22
96:5,7 103:22,25	causes 65:15 97:13	charts 36:4	257:11 259:5,23,23	202:18 205:4 206:7	257:16
104:1,25 106:15	214:1,9	cheaper 224:5	263:11 269:19,20	206:18 207:23	commonly 7:25 55:9
107:8,16,18 120:18	caution 198:25	check 85:18 111:21	clearer 84:23 85:23	210:5 213:7,20	community 228:1
121:22 122:1	caveat 48:10 240:4	138:23 139:16,25	clearest 261:1,5	214:13 215:2,6	compact 111:25
125:17 126:1,2	ceiling 42:25	Chenab 35:20 40:19	clearly 25:17 55:7	219:8,9 220:17	comparable 88:4
127:12 131:11,19	central 46:1 179:18	40:23 47:13 51:2	97:4 138:15,18	221:9 222:8,17,22	compare 108:13
131:24 134:19	221:15	86:9 105:5 122:15	141:23 173:2	224:11 225:19	compared 92:23 133:5
150:18,24 165:23	century 130:14	132:5,12,15 155:1	180:25 192:17	226:17 227:9 229:7	comparing 105:13
166:1 229:6,12	certain 40:18 49:15	229:9	193:6 201:14	229:19 230:16	compatible 204:18
230:1 233:4	55:8,9 65:21 67:24	chief 217:9	211:10 224:16	232:8,11,20 233:23	227:16 251:11
capital 17:25 18:2,11	75:18 92:6 95:1	choice 157:20 223:24	235:18 240:9,9	236:6 238:24	compelled 166:11,16 compensation 176:19
33:13 capture 202:15	97:13 127:15 136:19 161:18	224:13 choose 101:11,14	245:6 climate 220:5 250:16	239:16 242:6,13 243:13,23 244:2,6	176:21 177:6
capture 202:15 care 10:15	187:14 188:3	chooses 160:5 264:10	clinate 220:5 250:16 clock 195:12	244:23 245:9 248:2	competence 173:19
careful 13:11 24:17	208:23 244:19	Chorzów 177:20	close 71:15 85:2	251:13 252:10,17	176:23 183:18
59:1 235:7	262:18 266:21	182:17	103:10 104:15	253:8 255:6 259:21	190:9 203:11,20

204:16 206:10	97:19 130:7 211:25	confirm 108:7 166:15	constitutional 209:12	105:24 116:16	correct 3:24 4:7 32:3
207:8 234:24,25	212:1 213:6	166:16	constitutional 200.12	142:1 172:3,4	43:11,21,22 58:25
235:2,23 236:2,5	conception 223:19	confirmed 106:3	constrained 183:19	173:15 238:16	59:18 60:3,10,13,24
	229:15 255:5	122:23 135:8	187:24 214:20	continued 23:23	
238:20 239:22,25	258:17			173:14	61:7,15,24 62:3,14
242:4 243:21		confirming 139:19	217:25 240:24		68:8 97:25 108:5,6
252:21 269:23	concepts 3:14 52:16	conflated 127:18	244:21	continues 122:22	112:18 117:4,12,19
270:19,22	conceptualisation	conflicting 172:8	constraining 19:16	continuing 178:7	118:15,20 119:7,20
competences 203:9	91:19	189:4	constrains 67:25	184:12	119:21 206:3 225:1
competent 239:24	conceptually 96:25	conform 2:18	constraint 19:21	continuous 5:23	227:5
252:22	concern 36:17,18	confused 210:23	212:14,24	131:10	corrected 17:14
complete 33:1 106:3	37:25 116:17	211:25 260:4	constraints 147:17	continuously 12:20	correction 31:12 61:1
129:6 185:20 261:9	172:18 179:8	confusion 97:14	176:22 183:12,15	30:8 49:20	112:21 113:7,9,16
completed 154:20	216:20,21 217:2	231:18	249:4	continuum 84:4	114:19 115:10
completely 46:1 64:24	218:2,11 228:7	congruent 223:4	construct 21:24 25:3	contours 178:25 192:9	corrections 270:11
118:1 124:18 127:5	237:10	connected 8:25	27:16 67:25 151:9	contract 13:25 97:19	correctly 124:25
232:24,24 251:10	concerned 20:25	consecutive 39:25	225:17,20	97:22	168:11 261:8
270:15	25:10 28:25 37:11	64:3 66:8	constructed 41:12	contradict 182:15	correspond 48:15,17
completion 173:5	37:21 38:5 43:6	consequence 35:18	132:15 153:5	contradictions 172:12	126:15
complex 70:8,11	71:16 115:20	123:18	constructing 25:5	contradictory 172:15	correspondence 117:6
173:10	160:16 174:17	consequently 120:7	construction 18:11	contrary 123:20	117:8 222:14
complexity 3:8 68:15	178:3 182:23 194:2	123:6	36:2 146:16 162:4	164:15 166:2	corresponding 28:5
70:14,18	213:25 215:14	conservative 155:21	227:24 258:3	180:11 185:23	44:20 50:4 125:13
compliance 112:2	concerning 36:12	consider 1:20 27:15	constructs 45:16	188:7	126:4 149:1
181:14 182:4	65:21 158:18 169:4	38:25 39:6 46:10	264:11	contrast 10:24 49:9	correspondingly
184:16 223:9,15,19	175:2 176:10 181:3	67:12 91:16 93:25	consult 96:12 263:1	contribute 84:18	23:11 165:6
223:20 224:11	187:10 194:22	95:22,25 106:13	consumer 30:24	233:6	corresponds 7:18
227:7 247:10	concerns 22:13 36:19	109:24 164:5	consumers 9:1 64:1	contribution 230:2	corroborates 176:22
compliant 133:11	37:9 38:2,6,14	229:20 238:22	69:1	control 15:22 34:21	cost 9:3 220:23 224:10
complicated 40:11	175:13 177:4	249:23 250:4	consummate 237:18	34:24 35:15 53:24	224:11
47:8 78:2 109:14	178:14 179:13	260:16,21 261:4	consumption 30:25	57:20 62:5 90:17,19	Costa 170:19
complications 163:17	185:24,24 194:8	considerable 4:20	125:13 126:5	141:24 156:13	costs 18:1,3,12,15
complies 107:19	217:4 227:3 244:10	5:25 23:6 133:24	contact 271:15	160:19 165:12,24	251:24 252:3,4,5,8
111:14 112:8	265:11	154:18	contain 190:16,25	215:7	252:9,11,14,18
comply 132:9 134:13	concise 187:6	considerably 36:5	200:23	controllable 33:5	cost/benefit 18:19
220:24 223:18	conclude 137:5 206:25	68:15 69:10 109:4	contained 39:10	34:15,16	34:1
complying 223:17	211:2	consideration 67:19	111:20	controlling 42:24	counsel 2:20,20
227:6 249:3,10	concludes 158:8,17	136:12 204:3 220:4	contains 153:3	111:19 248:6	245:25
component 51:20	189:18	237:4,20 269:19	contemplate 205:20	249:25 263:18	counterproductive
56:12 233:13	concluding 4:12	considerations 118:25	226:16	controversy 46:8	79:25
261:14	175:25 206:21	119:2 186:13 187:7	contemplated 204:23	171:23 172:5	counter-memorial
components 34:12	conclusion 16:10	207:6 223:14	contemplating 190:5	173:13 177:7,16	56:8 125:8 270:9
comport 229:11 234:3	127:2 215:5 220:1	234:11,21	205:7,9 248:20	178:19,25	country 8:21 221:7
234:4	238:3 243:19	considered 29:16	contemporary 257:13	convene 251:3	261:23,25
composed 59:2 64:3	conclusions 118:13	32:15 33:3 72:11	258:13	convenience 160:25	countrywide 221:13
composition 199:20	179:19 187:22	75:20 96:2 105:16	contention 24:15	270:17	couple 14:19 189:25
comprehensive 177:9	244:15 260:24	110:6 119:7 121:18	contentious 180:19	convenient 70:5,25	course 1:22 2:20 6:24
185:7	concrete 14:9 149:16	131:18 144:20	contents 183:25	72:1 90:24	9:13 13:21 18:25
comprehensively	154:7 155:23	145:1 169:11	187:24	conventional 33:25	21:20 33:16 44:3
258:1					
	163:20 191:20	244:14 245:6 261:4	contested 172:2	Conversely 188:2	48:5 52:11 56:21
compromis 194:19	228:5,10,12,21	244:14 245:6 261:4 considering 89:1	contested 172:2 context 13:11,14	Conversely 188:2 convert 50:18	48:5 52:11 56:21 57:10 61:19 65:1
-			context 13:11,14		57:10 61:19 65:1
compromis 194:19 computation 60:9 134:22 135:12	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13	considering 89:1		convert 50:18	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6
computation 60:9	228:5,10,12,21	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6 77:16 79:3 86:16
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6 77:16 79:3 86:16 98:5,11 99:12 102:4
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6 77:16 79:3 86:16 98:5,11 99:12 102:4 107:2 111:5 113:20
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6 77:16 79:3 86:16 98:5,11 99:12 102:4 107:2 111:5 113:20 114:4 118:4 138:23
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6 77:16 79:3 86:16 98:5,11 99:12 102:4 107:2 111:5 113:20 114:4 118:4 138:23 138:23 142:2 143:1
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14 coordinates 170:8	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6 77:16 79:3 86:16 98:5,11 99:12 102:4 107:2 111:5 113:20 114:4 118:4 138:23 138:23 142:2 143:1 144:4 149:21
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14 coordinates 170:8 ccoordination 206:11 206:13	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6 77:16 79:3 86:16 98:5,11 99:12 102:4 107:2 111:5 113:20 114:4 118:4 138:23 138:23 142:2 143:1 144:4 149:21 154:10 155:25
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8 concede 139:23	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9 133:10	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22 107:10 116:25 146:15	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23 227:1 240:11	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14 coordinates 170:8 coordination 206:11 206:13 copy 90:21	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6 77:16 79:3 86:16 98:5,11 99:12 102:4 107:2 111:5 113:20 114:4 118:4 138:23 138:23 142:2 143:1 144:4 149:21 154:10 155:25 157:10 160:13
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8 concede 139:23 conceivable 123:16	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9 133:10 conducive 177:6	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22 107:10 116:25 146:15 consisting 194:20	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23 227:1 240:11 257:19,25 261:21	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14 coordinates 170:8 coordination 206:11 206:13 copy 90:21 core 20:24 23:17	57:10 61:19 65:1 66:15 70:8 71:2,6 77:16 79:3 86:16 98:5,11 99:12 102:4 107:2 111:5 113:20 114:4 118:4 138:23 138:23 142:2 143:1 144:4 149:21 154:10 155:25 157:10 160:13 162:22 163:16
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8 concede 139:23 conceivable 123:16 conceivably 84:10	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9 133:10 conducive 177:6 conduct 184:15	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22 107:10 116:25 146:15 consisting 194:20 constant 6:17 60:25	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23 227:1 240:11 257:19,25 261:21 262:2 269:18	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14 coordination 206:11 206:13 copy 90:21 core 20:24 23:17 217:2	$57:10\ 61:19\ 65:1\\66:15\ 70:8\ 71:2,6\\77:16\ 79:3\ 86:16\\98:5,11\ 99:12\ 102:4\\107:2\ 111:5\ 113:20\\114:4\ 118:4\ 138:23\\138:23\ 142:2\ 143:1\\144:4\ 149:21\\154:10\ 155:25\\157:10\ 160:13\\162:22\ 163:16\\164:9\ 189:22$
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8 concede 139:23 conceivable 123:16 conceivably 84:10 102:12 205:4	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9 133:10 conducive 177:6 conduct 184:15 251:19	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22 107:10 116:25 146:15 consisting 194:20 constant 6:17 60:25 83:3 112:21 113:7	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23 227:1 240:11 257:19,25 261:21 262:2 269:18 contexts 44:17	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14 coordinates 170:8 coordination 206:11 206:13 copy 90:21 core 20:24 23:17 217:2 cornerstone 173:24	$57:10\ 61:19\ 65:1$ $66:15\ 70:8\ 71:2,6$ $77:16\ 79:3\ 86:16$ $98:5,11\ 99:12\ 102:4$ $107:2\ 111:5\ 113:20$ $114:4\ 118:4\ 138:23$ $138:23\ 142:2\ 143:1$ $144:4\ 149:21$ $154:10\ 155:25$ $157:10\ 160:13$ $162:22\ 163:16$ $164:9\ 189:22$ $199:19,21\ 202:6$
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8 concede 139:23 conceivable 123:16 conceivably 84:10 102:12 205:4 concentrate 270:24	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9 133:10 conducive 177:6 conduct 184:15 251:19 conference 251:3	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22 107:10 116:25 146:15 consisting 194:20 constant 6:17 60:25 83:3 112:21 113:7 115:10 125:9 174:5	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23 227:1 240:11 257:19,25 261:21 262:2 269:18 contexts 44:17 contextual 66:5	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14 coordinates 170:8 coordinates 170:8 coordination 206:11 206:13 copy 90:21 core 20:24 23:17 217:2 cornerstone 173:24 corollaries 79:11	$57:10\ 61:19\ 65:1$ $66:15\ 70:8\ 71:2,6$ $77:16\ 79:3\ 86:16$ $98:5,11\ 99:12\ 102:4$ $107:2\ 111:5\ 113:20$ $114:4\ 118:4\ 138:23$ $138:23\ 142:2\ 143:1$ $144:4\ 149:21$ $154:10\ 155:25$ $157:10\ 160:13$ $162:22\ 163:16$ $164:9\ 189:22$ $199:19,21\ 202:6$ $204:4\ 208:12,15,18$
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8 concede 139:23 conceivable 123:16 conceivably 84:10 102:12 205:4 concentrate 270:24 concentrating 92:6	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9 133:10 conduct ve 177:6 conduct 184:15 251:19 conference 251:3 confesses 130:20	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22 107:10 116:25 146:15 consisting 194:20 constant 6:17 60:25 83:3 112:21 113:7 115:10 125:9 174:5 constantly 5:18 6:1	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23 227:1 240:11 257:19,25 261:21 262:2 269:18 contexts 44:17 contextual 66:5 contextualise 175:10	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14 coordinates 170:8 coordinates 170:8 coordination 206:11 206:13 copy 90:21 core 20:24 23:17 217:2 cornerstone 173:24 corollaries 79:11 217:24	$57:10\ 61:19\ 65:1\\ 66:15\ 70:8\ 71:2,6\\ 77:16\ 79:3\ 86:16\\ 98:5,11\ 99:12\ 102:4\\ 107:2\ 111:5\ 113:20\\ 114:4\ 118:4\ 138:23\\ 138:23\ 142:2\ 143:1\\ 144:4\ 149:21\\ 154:10\ 155:25\\ 157:10\ 160:13\\ 162:22\ 163:16\\ 164:9\ 189:22\\ 199:19,21\ 202:6\\ 204:4\ 208:12,15,18\\ 210:2,20\ 211:6\\ \end{cases}$
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8 concede 139:23 conceivable 123:16 conceivably 84:10 102:12 205:4 concentrate 270:24 concentrating 92:6 concept 3:12 4:13,14	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9 133:10 conducive 177:6 conduct 184:15 251:19 conference 251:3 confeseses 130:20 configuration 152:20	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22 107:10 116:25 146:15 consisting 194:20 constant 6:17 60:25 83:3 112:21 113:7 115:10 125:9 174:5 constantly 5:18 6:1 7:17 10:22 75:3	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23 227:1 240:11 257:19,25 261:21 262:2 269:18 context 44:17 ccontextual 66:5 contextual se 175:10 Continental 200:8	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperating 255:10 cooreration 225:14 coordinates 170:8 coordinates 170:8 coordination 206:11 206:13 copy 90:21 core 20:24 23:17 217:2 cornerstone 173:24 corollaries 79:11 217:24 corollary 211:20,22	$57:10\ 61:19\ 65:1\\ 66:15\ 70:8\ 71:2,6\\ 77:16\ 79:3\ 86:16\\ 98:5,11\ 99:12\ 102:4\\ 107:2\ 111:5\ 113:20\\ 114:4\ 118:4\ 138:23\\ 138:23\ 142:2\ 143:1\\ 144:4\ 149:21\\ 154:10\ 155:25\\ 157:10\ 160:13\\ 162:22\ 163:16\\ 164:9\ 189:22\\ 199:19,21\ 202:6\\ 204:4\ 208:12,15,18\\ 210:2,20\ 211:6\\ 224:13\ 232:5\\ \end{tabular}$
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8 concede 139:23 conceivable 123:16 conceivably 84:10 102:12 205:4 concentrate 270:24 concentrating 92:6 concept 3:12 4:13,14 4:14 8:16 20:12	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9 133:10 conducive 177:6 conduct 184:15 251:19 conference 251:3 confesses 130:20 configuration 152:20 confine 178:13 260:18	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22 107:10 116:25 146:15 consisting 194:20 constant 6:17 60:25 83:3 112:21 113:7 115:10 125:9 174:5 constantly 5:18 6:1 7:17 10:22 75:3 76:21 80:13 125:20	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23 227:1 240:11 257:19,25 261:21 262:2 269:18 context 44:17 contextual 66:5 contextualise 175:10 Continental 200:8 continually 78:10	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperation 225:14 coordinates 170:8 coordination 206:11 206:13 copy 90:21 core 20:24 23:17 217:2 cornerstone 173:24 corollaries 79:11 217:24 corollary 211:20,22 212:6 214:18	$\begin{array}{c} 57:10\ 61:19\ 65:1\\ 66:15\ 70:8\ 71:2,6\\ 77:16\ 79:3\ 86:16\\ 98:5,11\ 99:12\ 102:4\\ 107:2\ 111:5\ 113:20\\ 114:4\ 118:4\ 138:23\\ 138:23\ 142:2\ 143:1\\ 144:4\ 149:21\\ 154:10\ 155:25\\ 157:10\ 160:13\\ 162:22\ 163:16\\ 164:9\ 189:22\\ 199:19,21\ 202:6\\ 204:4\ 208:12,15,18\\ 210:2,20\ 211:6\\ 224:13\ 232:5\\ 235:15\ 237:24\end{array}$
computation 60:9 134:22 135:12 140:4 computationally 60:22 126:8 131:3 compute 82:2 computer 68:17 computers 60:8 concede 139:23 conceivable 123:16 conceivably 84:10 102:12 205:4 concentrate 270:24 concentrating 92:6 concept 3:12 4:13,14	228:5,10,12,21 239:19 264:13 condensed 103:14 condition 84:12 conditions 61:6 80:23 86:6 87:20 88:8 94:23 95:17 102:19 106:1 108:11,25 109:23 129:9 133:10 conducive 177:6 conduct 184:15 251:19 conference 251:3 confeseses 130:20 configuration 152:20	considering 89:1 104:21 239:8 251:4 considers 22:24 27:2 63:20 146:9 175:4 consistency 189:12 consistent 9:21,23 27:6 30:3 58:5,7 68:23 69:4,22 107:10 116:25 146:15 consisting 194:20 constant 6:17 60:25 83:3 112:21 113:7 115:10 125:9 174:5 constantly 5:18 6:1 7:17 10:22 75:3	context 13:11,14 16:21 17:21 20:17 21:14 26:12 38:25 41:23 55:12,13,17 98:15 119:25 129:8 169:18 186:9 208:16 209:2 210:18 213:2 216:10 219:23 227:1 240:11 257:19,25 261:21 262:2 269:18 context 44:17 ccontextual 66:5 contextual se 175:10 Continental 200:8	convert 50:18 converting 50:16 cook-up 233:5 cooperate 254:5 cooperating 255:10 cooperating 255:10 cooreration 225:14 coordinates 170:8 coordinates 170:8 coordination 206:11 206:13 copy 90:21 core 20:24 23:17 217:2 cornerstone 173:24 corollaries 79:11 217:24 corollary 211:20,22	$57:10\ 61:19\ 65:1\\ 66:15\ 70:8\ 71:2,6\\ 77:16\ 79:3\ 86:16\\ 98:5,11\ 99:12\ 102:4\\ 107:2\ 111:5\ 113:20\\ 114:4\ 118:4\ 138:23\\ 138:23\ 142:2\ 143:1\\ 144:4\ 149:21\\ 154:10\ 155:25\\ 157:10\ 160:13\\ 162:22\ 163:16\\ 164:9\ 189:22\\ 199:19,21\ 202:6\\ 204:4\ 208:12,15,18\\ 210:2,20\ 211:6\\ 224:13\ 232:5\\ \end{tabular}$

246:15 248:21	cubed 50:13 148:6	111:23 117:2,19	267:24 268:16	146:12,18,20	99:23 130:24
252:1,17,24 253:10	cubic 46:19 47:3,19	119:16,23 120:1,11	270:17 272:6	201:18 206:16	213:10 242:4 265:2
256:21,22 259:2	48:12,19 50:10 51:3	120:21 122:25	dark 229:15	213:7	defines 28:24 39:13
261:12 268:15	58:18,19 59:22,22	128:6 129:3,12	data 46:9,15 47:11,17	deals 28:3 63:2,3	definition 8:9 27:23
271:1,12	78:4,5,9,12,16,20	133:17 134:15	50:23 61:8,10,16,18	143:21 144:4	29:24 30:10 32:4
courtroom 238:16	78:21,22 81:19,21	135:7 136:7,21,22	65:17 66:14,15	dealt 14:15	42:19 43:8,13,18
252:12	81:23 82:12,14,15	138:5 143:19	105:2,6,17 109:7	decades 140:13	44:15 49:11 52:18
courts 191:25	86:3,17 87:2,18	144:21 146:3	110:20 112:25	December 130:13	52:20 65:4 75:13
court's 3:24 4:8 4:9	88:9 89:6 94:14	152:21 159:16	135:4,5,6 138:3	decide 205:17 224:8	99:3 119:16 120:23
103:1 135:18	101:14 105:12,14	160:8 211:4,16	139:22 226:11	253:8 255:2 266:7	124:10,15,19,22,24
141:12 143:1,4	106:11,18 125:2,5	212:14,24,24 217:9	date 101:11 135:2	decided 15:7 97:25	185:17 229:3 230:9
151:7 175:6 181:10	131:6,7,15,16 132:3	217:14,17 220:4	187:21	159:5 191:22	232:5,8,9 259:8
182:14 183:11,13	132:5 133:4 147:23	223:2 225:8 241:16	dated 72:13	201:23 206:5	262:22,23 263:6
184:6 185:19	148:15 155:1,4	242:15 247:11	day 1:6 1:4 5:18 7:18	decides 224:8	definitional 262:17
189:10 196:3 211:6	161:6,24 162:1,5,8	248:14 249:5	7:21 8:2 9:9,14,15	deciding 70:15 205:15	definitions 27:16,20
241:15,23 242:20	163:1,14	262:13	9:15,16,18 10:11,14	decision 151:8 169:12	32:23 52:16 53:20
250:9 269:11,19	cubic-metre-per-sec	daily 8:13 9:6,22	11:18,19,21 30:9	172:17,20 173:11	definitive 177:16
cover 246:13 268:21	99:11	10:13 11:22 29:22	31:17,21,22 34:5	173:20,22 178:11	degree 263:7
covered 181:23	cumulative 35:11,18	30:1 32:10,12,13	39:14 56:1 63:25	178:16 179:1,5	Delhi 229:16 263:17
182:25	35:21 54:8	39:14 40:9 46:14	64:5,8 73:2,5 74:20	180:16,19 184:8	deliberate 149:8
				-	
covers 172:20	current 141:7 152:20	47:11 49:3 63:3,7	75:5,21 76:4,10,23	185:5,22 186:22	deliberately 30:12
Creager 96:4 258:4,23	153:7 163:2,10	63:16,19,20 64:3	78:1 81:18,21,24	187:12,14 190:9	98:6 134:18
create 157:19,23	currently 148:18	65:6,8,12,16,17,24	86:9 92:7 93:9 95:8	202:15 235:25	deliberations 215:5
160:14	191:21 193:10	66:14,18 67:4,8,14	99:12 104:7,8,8	251:25 253:11	227:22 234:12
creates 5:12	cursorily 178:22	68:13,21,25 69:7,8	109:2 123:4 142:2	265:6,8 271:17	236:5
creating 237:19	curve 9:2,4,6,25 10:12	71:17 74:5 76:24	142:10,11 145:20	decisions 189:5	delimitation 170:12
creation 7:11	11:22,22 12:12,14	77:23 82:1,4,6	169:6 173:15,19	191:16 192:1,4	170:15,17,18,20
crest 163:7.10	12:16,21,24 13:15	93:22 94:17 98:15	229:18,18,18,18	199:3,12,25,25	185:17
crest-gated 147:2	13:16 31:5,6,9,15	102:11 105:2,22	235:19 244:1 265:1	200:1,22,23,24	delimited 170:12
156:7 159:24		-	267:10	200:1,22,23,24 203:17 248:7 269:1	
	64:2 89:1,7 90:2	110:19 120:6,16			delineating 179:25
164:23	91:12,13,16,17,21	122:15 125:9 214:2	days 9:17,20,22 39:25	decision-maker 203:6	deliver 73:3 174:24
criteria 2:19 31:25	93:6,17 94:10 95:22	214:10 233:14	46:22 48:23 56:12	203:7	176:2
32:14 41:17 59:6,13	96:1 97:5 103:8	256:25 257:5,17	63:11,17 64:6 66:9	decision-making	delivered 39:25
62:9 67:17 68:8	113:13,14,22 114:2	258:25 260:1	69:2 74:17,19	191:17 202:14	delivers 13:2
69:12 112:9 115:12	114:3,6,17,17 126:4	dam 18:10 28:13,17	107:15 132:6,13	declaration 182:4	delivery 18:4
119:17 133:11	126:23 130:12	29:13 33:13 149:16	159:2 171:25	187:9 188:15,20	demand 7:19,23 8:14
134:20 135:16	135:1,8,10,10	153:4,15 154:7,7	206:11 232:12	declaratory 171:13	9:8,9,12,14,14 10:7
143:19,22 144:8	137:19,20 138:22	157:21 158:13,14	266:6	175:12,15 176:3,6,7	10:13,14 11:2 12:6
	-		day-to-day 32:2		
155:24 223:11	140:4,6 224:22	161:1 162:13,19,20		177:1,15,22 178:5	16:1 56:12 57:17
227:8 228:19	258:24	163:7,10,12,16,19	109:18	178:10 180:16	65:7 73:5 91:22,23
247:11 249:4	curves 10:13 12:1,4,5	163:20 164:1 165:7	dead 14:3,11 25:20	181:12,17 182:1	92:11,13,18 114:13
criterion 20:13,15	64:3 126:7 128:8	165:9,19 214:9,10	27:24,24 28:1,1,10	183:1,23,25 184:3	120:9 126:15 130:9
27:17 32:4,13 37:4	131:4 138:17,18	227:24 228:7,18	28:16,16,19 33:15	184:10,13,24	demands 9:1 56:14
39:9 60:1,23 61:3	139:11,12,14	258:3 264:11,11,12	33:17,20 34:8,10,14	185:11,14 186:2,4	demarcation 170:8,20
104:4 106:23 107:3	customary 178:6	damage 110:12	34:20 103:15 110:2	193:25	demonstrate 118:17
109:12 120:20	184:11	111:24 124:8 219:8	110:4 132:8 138:10	declare 247:18	175:20
123:10,10,15	cut 195:18 206:24	Damocles 229:24	144:16,19,25	declined 184:18	dense 60:22 68:17
136:14	cutting 218:16	dampen 141:2	146:11,13,19 147:5	decompression 266:19	81:11 126:8,9
critical 2:14 27:21,23	out and threat 212/16			decrease 88:21,22	127:24 131:3
	cut-and-thrust 212:16	dams 155:23 167:18	147:20 148:10,12	2	
32:6 35:23 43:7	CWC 221:15	239:14 261:21,22	148:17 149:1 150:5	decreasing 5:10 89:9	densely 39:7
57:23 62:12 64:15	cycle 63:16,17,20	dangerous 118:20	150:10 151:24,25	162:17	density 50:12 256:11
76:3 96:22 98:2	64:14,15 66:8 70:13	165:16	152:5 153:7,10,21	deep 146:18 149:21	denying 172:24
111:16 213:6	71:24 233:13,21	Daniel 2:9 4:10,13 1:6	154:1,11,21 155:5	150:5 153:12,22,24	depart 176:24
223:18	234:1,15	1:8,12,23 2:24	155:12 156:8 157:3	155:7,10,15 156:1	depend 74:15 255:8
critically 30:10 89:18	cycles 63:24	72:17 90:16,25 96:3	157:8,12,16,22,25	158:25 159:3,10,20	dependent 57:25 62:2
212:15	-	96:18 115:17 116:6	158:5,9 160:12	160:11,18 163:25	97:10
Croatia 194:17 195:6	D	139:5 140:16,22	161:3 162:17,23	164:10 165:11,22	depending 10:6 140:2
cross-reference		141:25 143:11	163:9 164:3,20,22	211:9 250:21	depends 40:11 58:17
190:23 196:17	d 1:10 2:5,10,15 7:9	171:15,24 189:20	165:8	deeper 3:1 12:23	114:3 135:12 140:1
	19:25 20:2 21:20,23			-	
cross-reference-style	22:5 23:25 25:6,21	192:24 193:21,25	deadline 265:20	154:4 218:13	deplete 147:5 150:10
191:11	27:4,12,14 30:16	195:11,15,25 196:2	deal 101:19 114:1	deeply 25:10	depleting 158:9
cross-referencing	37:17 41:8 43:9	196:4 202:25 204:2	115:12 162:11	default 40:13	depletion 33:20
170:3,25 194:4	47:13,16 49:17	204:11,13 206:2,22	176:3 196:23	defendant 174:21	deployed 7:13 68:8
cross-refers 197:15	51:23 52:6 61:21,23	253:13,16 254:15	206:14,15 209:4	defer 116:3 256:22	112:15
198:4	63:7,10 65:19 66:13	255:16,24 256:22	248:19	define 58:11 260:19	deposit 153:2
crucial 44:8 223:24	66:17,24,25 69:7	257:24 259:5 260:9	dealing 34:2 46:16	defined 43:13 45:14	depth 148:21
	00.17,27,23 07.7		65:13 101:20	46:18 53:3 56:24	Deputy 2:19 245:20
	86.15 105.7 110.10	202:10 204:20	05.15 101.20		
crucially 66:7	86:15 105:7 110:19	262:10 264:20 265:12 266:7.14			1 0
	86:15 105:7 110:19 110:21 111:17,18	265:12 266:7,14	115:19 133:16	65:4 76:3 96:5	derive 134:22

derived 12:4 50:8	58:25 66:5 146:10	90:13	197:12,14,20,24	175:22 197:10	245:4
51:14,18 59:23	169:5 185:10 186:3	disagree 178:13	198:3,13,19 200:13	221:12 252:14	drop 48:22 77:3,4
62:23 112:13 160:6	216:8	disagreement 60:19	244:7,8,13 247:6,15	256:17 265:21	93:13 109:4 130:2
derives 145:25 160:4	detriment 222:2	62:11 70:21 113:3	dispositifs 170:3,21	271:25	drops 89:5
desander 255:4	detriments 134:11	202:17 209:11	196:12	domain 238:5	dry 5:8 6:16,19,23
desanders 148:25	develop 23:15 70:9	disagreements 61:12	dispositive 250:17	DON 1:11	10:24 13:8 47:6
221:1 224:7	105:8 153:22	112:18 172:8 174:9	dispute 45:8 67:10	done 6:20 31:4 35:5	48:24 49:8,22 74:9
describe 82:22	developed 26:5 59:5	187:21	168:3,7 172:2,3,14	37:7 60:18 68:16	75:4 76:21 109:22
described 63:4 86:2,7	100:25 151:17	discern 98:1	176:9,18 177:3,11	70:17,18 71:11 86:1	132:13 234:7
155:19 168:5	152:17 169:2	discharge 5:15,17,22	180:18 181:22	92:20 111:7 120:19	due 1:21 5:7 48:4
214:17 254:20	developing 37:21 61:6	16:15 24:3 29:21	182:9 183:17	134:8 136:24 142:9	56:21 57:10 65:1
describes 125:7	101:23 208:14	30:1 39:17 40:10,16	184:21 185:2,21	151:14 159:22	66:15 70:7 83:24
description 145:14	development 26:11	40:24 44:20,22 45:6	186:9 188:2,25	161:20 162:20	98:5 113:20 114:4
designated 34:19	61:4	51:25 55:19 65:23	189:3,10,13 191:20	192:1 225:12 233:9	138:23 142:16
97:18	developments 61:2	66:14 67:20 68:25	192:10 198:6	donned 208:24	208:11 235:15
designed 35:6 41:11	112:22	69:9 73:3 77:15,20	200:12 201:21	door 101:4	238:13 239:4 240:1
222:25	develops 29:1	81:22 86:5 92:17	202:17 204:17,18	dotted 5:14	238.13 239.4 240.1 242:1 243:23
designer 6:12 7:2	device 222:20 237:1				
5		94:15 101:11,15	215:21 217:15,16	double 85:17 106:9	248:21 252:1,17,24
14:11,25 15:7 18:16	238:1 249:12	108:15,24,25 109:5	222:4 224:24 227:2	111:8 126:19	256:21,22 259:2
19:9,11,13,14 31:10	devices 19:10	120:8 121:2,14	235:15 238:15	128:10 131:23	268:14 270:25
designing 19:17	devising 56:20	123:4,14,17 125:12	239:9,9,10 242:12	136:17	271:11
114:13 221:11	dictates 5:3 110:12	125:16 126:22	243:16 244:11	doubled 4:3 112:5	duelling 143:18
designs 152:16 156:24	dictating 185:13	128:4,7,14 135:11	248:7 250:11	126:11 131:6	dump 269:5
166:12 227:16	dictionary 97:19,22	139:1,3 146:5	252:20,22	doubles 160:10	duplicative 189:4
264:11	die 272:12	150:23 151:1	disputed 184:25	doubling 106:19 107:8	durable 179:15
desirable 33:11,17	differ 10:5 40:18	161:21,23 185:20	186:11	107:11 163:13	duration 12:1,4,16,21
159:4	difference 67:10 74:15	256:9	disputes 171:22 177:5	doubt 20:1 180:2	13:10,15 55:8 56:1
desire 143:17	97:7 98:1 101:14	discharged 40:21 79:2	179:16,18 181:5	209:1 234:12	79:7 104:25 194:24
desired 166:24	114:4,5 137:19	79:16 93:12 94:7	188:4 189:17	258:20	during 5:20 6:6,10,14
desktop 60:16 68:17	231:4,7	discharging 63:25	191:23 198:22	doubts 172:19	6:16,19 7:20 8:21
despite 88:6 129:18	differences 43:25 44:4	88:20 110:11	225:3 242:17	down 7:17 42:13	9:9,11,18 10:10,24
151:2 167:8,10	45:19,20 221:24	disclosed 270:22	dispute-settlers 203:8	86:19 87:6,21 102:1	13:8 16:6 18:4
172:1,12 222:5	242:2	discrepancies 61:10	204:1	109:25 129:14	35:22 39:24 40:1,15
destined 179:11	different 10:6 38:17	discuss 19:22 109:13	disputing 172:24	141:2 150:1 153:24	49:15,21,25 63:24
detail 20:21 32:18	44:2 45:9 46:3 53:1	discussed 3:14 19:7	disruptive 24:22	162:17 163:19	63:25 64:5 73:5
46:10 51:8 169:2	63:3 64:21 76:5	29:10 30:5 52:4	dissolution 173:5	178:12 179:7,23	74:10 80:3 92:6
199:5 208:8 214:23	82:18 101:5 114:23	118:24 135:7	distinct 187:17,19	202:21 221:19	107:16 114:14
219:12 228:23	115:3 123:4 139:13	151:22 174:9	distinction 31:3 32:5	228:18 246:20	123:3 125:15
246:21 247:7	172:6,14 181:5,10	178:16	52:7,9 64:14 96:16	255:25	127:15 128:7,7,23
264:17	182:6 196:23	discussing 104:12	96:23 119:9	downstream 105:5	140:19 142:2 158:4
detailed 15:21 44:21	197:10 203:9	134:25 193:13	distinguishing 185:10	110:8 132:8 254:24	173:18 208:14
170:5 171:19	220:25 237:16	234:12	distorts 134:14	drafters 3:20 41:12	230:8 234:7 246:7
174:24 186:4	differential 25:21,24	discussion 4:15	diurnal 8:14 10:9	60:10 61:14 81:14	dust 221:19 246:16
188:19 208:11	differentiation 209:20	116:12 119:5,8	63:25 65:7 69:1	112:16 132:18	duties 180:24 219:1
209:5 269:14	differently 17:8	190:17 191:1	divergent 179:23	257:7,21	duty 185:20 188:24
details 85:2 171:6	184:20	226:21 228:14	diverse 183:25 188:19	drafting 60:7 259:11	240:7,15 252:15
detain 190:1	differing 254:8	255:18 262:2	diverted 4:21 53:1	drain 110:7	duty-bound 27:6
determination 69:11	difficult 58:14,16	discussions 159:1	divide 50:20	dramatic 214:4	129:19
71:5 118:2,9,19	163:3 174:4 228:22	disinterested 118:8	divided 82:4 207:2	drastically 19:11	dwell 22:8
124:11 127:24	267:8 271:24	dismiss 237:5	254:21	draw 20:23 111:10	d'être 46:2 136:7
169:10 170:14	difficulties 172:10	dispatch 8:23	diving 3:1	194:15 207:17	198:19 229:11
172:9 200:6 242:21	179:3 196:22,22	dispatched 93:11	division 11:14,17 38:9	208:2 211:1,12	D.3 3:18 27:21 32:25
determinations	198:25 224:15	dispatches 30:7	38:10	216:3	39:9,18 46:14 54:23
170:22 179:20	difficulty 119:19	display 9:17	divorce 101:6	drawdown 151:10	59:23 61:20 66:4
determinative 41:13	148:1 161:12	disposed 174:8	document 1:14,15	160:17 224:1	103:21 104:2 110:1
determine 3:2 4:2	197:18 226:22	disposes 178:21	47:25 72:12 153:2	drawn 59:6 73:14	112:13 136:3
8:16 18:19 43:15	dimension 217:3	dispositif 4:5 168:18	206:13 236:4	185:12 198:21	
58:22 80:23 110:22	diminish 219:15	168:24 169:16	268:22 270:8	214:23 259:13	E
111:8 126:6 127:22	dint 211:8	170:2,19 174:13,25	documents 234:23	draws 191:1	e 21:23 22:5 23:2,5,13
128:8 169:15	directed 9:7 91:25	175:11,21 176:5	236:22 268:5,20	dredging 151:13	24:12 25:4,15,17,19
185:21 218:21	239:3 246:10	178:18,20 179:13	269:5,6,22,24 270:7	158:7	26:6,14 27:4 29:5
242:2 256:15	direction 42:9 116:2	183:4,6,14 187:18	270:15,21,24 271:1	drew 139:5	81:15 85:2 86:17
determined 15:25	141:15 143:12	187:24 188:3,17	271:1,2,4,5,6,6,10	drive 26:3 34:11 43:21	89:19 133:1,10,13
30:6,19 77:25 125:9	180:13 206:6	189:7,15 190:5,8,12	dog 97:23,23	driven 92:3 140:15	133:14 134:3
126:20 179:6	270:19	190:15,16,23,24,25	doing 12:20 31:16	231:6,6,10 240:25	
252:21 267:14	directions 1:19 251:2	191:7,11 192:15	52:19 57:2,17 68:2	269:11	149:22 223:1
determines 173:5	251:8,10,18	194:5,7,14,20	75:5 76:22 98:22	drives 93:6 229:12	227:18 242:15
determining 17:22	directly 23:24 39:6	196:16,17,20 197:7	114:20 116:24	driving 216:18,24	each 10:14 23:15 30:7
		1,0110,17,20 1,77.7	11.120 110.21	, I	46:18,20 47:1,3

59:22 64:6 112:4,8	electrical 50:17,19	engages 144:21	entitle 54:17	192:3 200:20	224:2,23 230:8
112:13 174:11	electricity 9:11 125:13	engender 180:3	entitled 25:5 75:2	evacuated 29:13	232:25 241:21
200:3 255:9	126:5 233:7	engineer 15:20 75:15	76:19 121:12,18	Evacuation 142:16	259:6 261:1 262:21
earlier 3:14 5:4 51:22	electronic 60:8	100:14 113:21,25	125:23 129:16	even 10:25 13:5 19:15	262:22 269:12
67:17 69:13 72:23	element 19:16 40:11	209:3 210:4,11	146:24 166:15,21	24:13 25:20 33:19	examples 170:4 191:5
75:12 86:7 96:8	42:24 149:15,17	engineering 8:9,11	167:4,9,11 172:25	56:25 65:23 70:10	191:11 192:14,15
104:9 112:9 134:25	188:4 230:13	11:15 15:22 31:13	175:21 186:18	75:16 83:23,25,25	192:16 197:16
138:13 190:22	233:20	53:24 57:21 80:20	212:21,23 217:18	88:2,12 90:7 91:16	200:7 206:3 220:7
236:25	elements 14:8 15:1	90:5 91:13 92:9	270:14	94:19,23 98:21	excavation 18:10
earliest 171:25 255:15	239:7 240:21 251:1	94:21 97:16 101:6	entitlement 67:25	102:21 104:23	exceed 2:23 43:1
255:25	elephant 216:24	101:21,23 103:15	212:8,10 213:1	105:25 107:7	79:24 99:1 120:13
early 258:19	elevate 120:20	137:18,23 208:20	214:19 215:13	108:14,24 109:10	231:16,22
ease 68:16	elevation 153:4	209:15,23 210:1,5	218:3,11 219:4	117:18 122:20	exceeds 5:17
easier 18:18 45:3	154:16	210:14 225:17,20	221:8 270:2,6,7	133:7 135:10	except 2:17 21:8,23
90:14	Eliciting 142:2	226:8 227:11	entrails 212:17 216:11	167:19 168:12	29:2 92:12 138:21
easiest 98:19	eliminated 63:12	234:11,14 249:2	entry 86:8 87:21	172:16,16 173:12	exception 21:13,13
easily 61:9 112:15	elsewhere 248:8	258:3	177:13	178:22 192:5,7	22:5 111:18 119:24
east 221:7	elucidated 269:10	engineers 6:6 9:5	envelope 188:9	209:10 230:15	212:8,10,12 213:18
Eastern 23:13 38:10	embankment 149:15	11:15 52:17 124:20	environment 14:24	256:19 259:24	214:6,19,20 219:4,7
215:8,19,24 218:16	149:17 163:19	141:24 152:13	228:1	265:22	219:9,14
easy 45:4 60:12 86:18	embark 207:25	159:5 234:13	envisages 203:17	evening 259:20 267:2	exceptional 213:1
eat 137:11	Embassy 2:7,8	257:15	256:6	272:9	215:12
eating 133:24 140:23	emerge 169:23 171:22	enhance 179:15	EPA 265:6	event 30:13 134:23	exceptionally 115:16
economic 220:22,22	183:13	enhanced 6:19	equal 34:24 49:25	157:18 169:15	115:20
economical 20:11	emerged 224:16	enhancing 184:23	85:6 266:22	events 33:16 272:8	exceptions 21:18
146:16 223:8,12	emerges 184:6 220:10	enlarge 218:23	equalling 148:6	eventually 88:19	38:12 176:11
227:19 262:23	emphasis 17:21 43:11	enlarged 162:21	equally 62:6 86:14	93:19 94:1 114:24	217:25 243:8
263:8	43:20	163:21	87:8 177:16	124:9 126:25	exception[s 248:25
economy 186:5,7,9	emphasised 132:24	enormous 153:11	equals 102:6	133:22 173:18	excessive 35:9
187:13,13 244:20	emphasises 146:1	enough 6:4 9:13 78:18	equated 230:7	ever 93:10 109:8	exchange 65:17
effect 24:22 169:6	empty 150:6	82:7 105:22 132:13	equation 51:13 97:13	every 39:21 64:8	139:15 140:10
177:11 182:5,25	enable 62:4 68:1 75:3	218:3,12	256:8	82:19 89:20,22 95:8	230:13
186:24 198:1	76:20 102:13	enquiry 101:5 211:6	equations 103:7,12	130:2 146:4,4	exchanges 140:12
217:13 226:13	128:23 156:6	219:5 238:24	equilibrium 80:10	157:16 167:25	208:16
248:6	226:12 242:1	242:20	88:21	221:1,2,2 227:20,25	excluded 2:13 172:19
effective 179:15	enables 73:1	ensuing 178:2 182:23	equitable 173:21	everybody 240:14	198:6 223:25
189:15	enabling 6:16 7:19	ensure 77:9 80:24	equivalent 81:20	everybody's 196:5	249:16
effectively 77:11 120:21 127:3 130:7	121:3 encapsulated 250:7	102:20 177:23 184:15 216:15	82:13 111:2 131:9 error 56:4,8 105:17	everyone 1:3 31:18 72:9 217:12	exclusive 34:23 119:22 121:18
120.21 127.3 130.7 185:2 197:11	end 79:1,17 133:22	237:23 246:22	122:7	everything 21:12	129:25 130:1
225:10	143:22 144:5 145:5	ensured 37:21	errors 57:8 61:10	119:23 216:24	133:25
effectiveness 27:7	171:7 177:16	ensures 110:9	113:2 122:9 135:3	236:16 246:22	exclusively 99:16
69:23	195:24 245:12	ensuring 17:24 110:13	escape 242:22	250:10 240.22	176:4
effects 39:11 169:19	253:4 260:6 268:7	111:22	especially 120:1	evidence 34:4 174:2	exclusivity 215:7
178:2 182:22	270:12 271:2	entail 18:9,11,14	125:13 163:17	181:18 224:17	excuse 64:10 249:12
194:25 203:8	endanger 118:21	33:12 67:19	essence 181:12 219:20	236:9 243:19 246:5	executed 60:5
efficiency 50:15,25	ended 127:9	entailed 169:11	230:18	246:7,8 247:17	exercise 26:17,20 73:8
100:14 115:11	endorsing 101:9	entailing 18:13	essential 22:25 27:11	evident 204:19 208:15	73:10 81:3,13 103:5
256:10	ends 127:4 166:7	enter 72:15 155:16	29:15 107:21	evidently 143:16	133:8 182:14 183:7
efficient 50:18 152:9	271:17	entered 79:2 159:17	109:18 111:21	ex 39:9 158:10 179:7	184:19 188:25
157:1 223:7	enduring 70:22	221:22	118:10 175:4 216:8	exactly 77:24 95:18	212:12 213:1 235:2
effort 70:12 152:16	energy 18:4 50:16,17	entering 81:4 83:18	243:5	98:4 114:12 126:15	241:1 243:5
either 18:9 27:4 35:4	50:18,19 52:8,9,18	166:4	essentially 29:11	140:13 154:22	exercising 186:6
40:14 70:7 128:15	52:21 53:2,4,10,18	enters 40:2 68:14	91:15 108:21	216:9 244:4 248:19	exhibit 47:24 217:7,8
150:15 176:11	53:21,22 54:1,4,7,7	77:15	110:17 202:9	255:21 258:12	exigencies 177:2
178:22 179:4	54:19,21 56:3,11,11	entertaining 182:13	essentials 129:15	examination 119:14	exist 107:21
194:12 201:24	56:14,17 57:4,4,14	enthusiasm 208:5	Essex 2:9,10	214:23 224:17	existing 19:18 147:22
203:20 225:17,20	57:15,16,16,18 73:1	entire 13:12 36:1	establish 62:20	examine 46:13 156:11	155:13 157:6
230:3 253:18	94:6 100:21 127:18	37:12 77:23 105:9	established 44:12	186:13 258:7	165:13 180:24
elaborate 113:8	engage 19:20 116:18	105:10 114:15	178:1 182:21 195:7	example 10:8 24:11	194:12
194:20 201:10	145:1 225:6 255:18	128:2 162:7 271:22	199:15	26:17 47:11 50:22	exists 41:6
elaborated 200:24	engaged 180:12	entirely 23:11 25:8	establishes 44:8	51:15 54:18 62:2	expand 13:25
elaborates 199:4	193:10 222:10	32:3 89:9 92:3	119:22 124:16	63:6,10 76:9 78:3	expanded 171:19
247:7	226:5 241:2 242:20	97:10 102:8 115:13	establishing 66:3	81:23 113:12 114:7	194:14
elaborating 168:23	247:5	135:5 144:19,25	estimation 144:12	117:5 142:19	expect 48:21 140:7
elaboration 43:24	engagement 224:14	150:6 178:23	146:3,21	151:12 158:6 167:8	142:4 162:1 186:18
200:11,15 208:11	251:6	227:16 237:16,16	et 42:21 249:16	191:7 198:11 199:6	195:1 245:2 252:15
electric 114:11	engagements 222:13	257:3	Ethiopia-Eritrea	200:21 220:9 224:2	253:21

		1	1	1	
expectation 140:20	extremely 13:6 143:8	33:11,16 162:15	135:17 136:18	133:15 146:4	130:9
expected 49:19 204:1	149:23 151:8	fashion 145:23 259:4	145:3 164:9 175:25	148:22 153:23,25	forecasting 114:20
267:17	154:15	fast 175:8	207:13 252:19	154:19 185:18	forefronts 217:1
expeditious 117:22	eye 235:7 239:11	fate 7:3	267:1	fixes 16:14 122:23	Foreign 2:5
187:6	E1 47:17	FATIMA 2:7	financial 176:19,20	130:13 144:16	foremost 111:14
expeditiously 145:6	E2 90:7 91:2,3,5	favour 68:20 178:18	financing 19:17	fixing 14:2,3,4 41:5	179:17
expense 33:14,24	103:10	favourable 126:17	find 22:15 59:8 90:6,6	114:17	foreseeing 114:21
expensive 18:6,7,7		favourite 83:14	90:9,14 97:20	flag 159:7 268:2	foreshadowed 143:10
33:13,23	F	favours 164:10	118:13 158:5,15	flatten 89:7	forestall 228:10
experience 199:6	f 67:10 227:18 242:4	feasibility 254:9	198:5 210:14	flexibility 10:17 36:16	forestalling 113:3
experiences 227:23	242:15	feasible 267:19	218:15 230:9	112:6 169:22 177:8	forget 231:2
expert 117:4,10,25	fabric 118:22	feast-or-famine 5:13	237:25 258:10	263:7	forgive 81:10 218:6
126:12 172:9 193:5	face 54:10 185:22	feature 16:16 22:19	259:7 263:14	floating 148:24	266:18
203:5,21 204:21	faced 27:1 181:7	147:6 149:7 160:22	268:18	flood 23:15 35:7 110:8	forgone 159:17
205:8,10,15 209:21	201:17,19 236:18	164:7 165:10 223:5	finding 118:3,15	150:25 152:5	form 32:13 66:16 71:9
209:21 235:13,13	240:17	features 151:22	141:3 181:25	156:10 157:13	92:13 110:5 141:2
235:21 236:2 238:6	facie 39:9 158:10	153:17 165:3 183:4	findings 170:22	159:22 160:19	171:14 176:5,7
238:7,9 239:22,24	facilitate 189:2	February 47:7,21	172:15 188:19	164:12,19 165:11	177:9 180:2 184:3
241:24,25 243:21	facing 228:5	48:9	190:17 247:5	floods 158:4	185:9 193:24 194:6
248:13,15 251:7	0	fed 256:13 263:3	249:23 250:4	floodwater 29:12	198:22 201:8
252:13 255:1 261:6	fact 29:14 33:5 71:17 85:25 89:11 93:21	feel 116:12,18 140:2	fine 141:23 160:23	110:7	207:11 213:16
265:14		159:9 204:12	finger 97:6 231:3,4	floor 150:2	241:8 244:6,7,19
expertise 254:23	97:7 114:10 129:4	240:13 242:8	finish 115:25 140:21	flowing 28:14 51:2	formal 238:9
expert's 118:9 254:8	134:20 167:8,10	251:12 268:10	141:7	52:25 55:19 80:19	formality 245:19
explain 3:12,18,23 4:6	173:9 179:8 184:18	269:10	finished 128:18	82:25,25 83:5,13,21	formally 207:19
47:9 81:16 123:8	197:23 203:5 222:6	feet 2:3 141:11 271:9	fire 142:16,18 204:5	86:9 132:5 140:14	format 198:10
125:3	225:4 228:4 231:8,8	felt 123:12	firmly 173:13	flows 27:10 46:14	formats 201:1
explained 6:10 10:19	facto 61:23 146:24	few 11:3 32:20 48:23	firmness 237:23	73:25 88:10 108:14	former 74:22 171:15
48:11 69:16 72:23	factor 69:14 70:15				188:10
48:11 09:10 72:25	80:17 184:6 185:4	48:23 103:13 159:1	first 1:7 2:7,8 1:4 2:16	120:15 136:4	
	185:10 186:3 187:8	175:25 190:1	3:11 6:12 27:15,23	fluctuating 122:21	forming 160:13
explanation 269:6	factors 15:23 19:5	232:12 253:21	28:23 32:10 33:10	fluctuations 29:21,25	forms 60:9 176:21
explanatory 103:13	32:14 125:3 135:23	265:16	36:21 44:8 52:18	65:23 66:19 122:14	183:11,24
explicitly 190:25	136:19 169:25	fiction 56:19	59:18 63:1 65:8	123:14	formula 44:21 46:7,12
explore 200:18	Factory 177:20	Fietta 2:11,11,12,12	68:23 73:16 75:11	flush 150:4 159:15	49:1 50:7 70:23
exposition 84:24	facts 181:5 200:6	2:13 117:16 169:1	82:10 86:8 100:5	164:11 220:20	74:7 89:21 105:18
expounds 178:6	228:21 247:17	169:13,20 172:13	105:7,15 110:18	flushing 151:6,10	167:6,15 171:9
184:10	failing 126:21	173:12 174:12	111:14 135:24	154:21 156:4,6	230:21
express 33:20 38:7	fails 59:13 134:21	197:3	137:7 144:13 145:7	158:10 160:17	formulated 37:12
175:13 180:12	135:15	fifth 1:3 17:5 61:15	145:8,14,19 148:4	164:18 224:1	formulating 142:3
264:20	failure 264:15	74:25	154:25 161:8	flux 55:7 75:22,23	formulation 97:8
expressed 48:11 55:6	fair 53:9,13 57:13	figure 48:11,12 49:6	166:15,22 168:20	focus 22:19 62:10	102:7 110:16 189:9
194:9 217:5	96:22 97:1 173:21	50:20 51:13 85:16	169:4 172:5 173:18	141:6 214:15	244:21 264:2
expressing 25:14	252:12	86:1 90:6,7,15 91:4	175:10 177:4	focused 193:6 207:17	forth 20:7 140:14
expressly 61:17	fairly 36:18 53:25	91:9 93:2 104:23	178:15 179:17	213:3	176:15 179:20
134:18 152:1	154:8	106:9 107:4 111:8	180:9 183:5,9 184:6	focusing 216:10	forthcoming 224:18
176:20 243:2,6,9	fairness 164:18	112:20 125:3 132:1	190:7 192:14 194:2	follow 32:9 64:25	forward 70:23 76:6
252:7	faith 178:23 219:23,24	245:23	205:15 206:13,15	175:21 183:18	98:5 142:12 166:25
extended 63:16	226:1 237:18	figured 160:9	207:4,7 208:1	203:1	167:6 180:5,25
132:14	fall 22:6 181:15 202:8	figures 116:10	210:16 211:3,15	followed 205:21	184:7 185:1,4 195:1
extending 203:12	205:13	fill 89:15 93:13 132:7	227:4 234:21 235:6	following 2:19 21:9	245:6 250:15
extension 27:12 130:5	falling 50:17,19 58:2	filled 51:12 79:15 80:2	235:12 236:4	22:16 40:8 46:21	251:16 272:4
extensive 192:8	89:9 133:9	80:11 93:12	250:10 253:1 254:1	98:12 120:3 125:6	fossil 30:8
extent 4:25 25:12 30:3	falls 5:22 77:4 102:15	filling 80:5 86:24 89:3	254:7 262:12	128:25 135:22	found 84:23 85:23
109:9 116:11	111:1 182:11	final 3:10 13:19 52:2	263:10 268:18	165:3 169:12	136:8 170:10,23
136:19 158:3	false 186:6	71:13 72:21 127:1	270:5	171:25 199:16	171:1 188:21
176:24 191:5	familiar 7:12 20:18	143:7 198:1,10	Fisheries 180:21	237:5 238:9 270:19	204:16 213:15
209:17,18 215:12	116:10 145:21,24	199:18 200:3,5	fit 32:11 107:1 113:15	follows 22:24 44:21	222:11
232:17 257:8,20	147:13,15 160:4	207:14,18 208:11	131:22 163:11	48:20 84:17 125:19	foundation 119:1
extinguish 179:11	199:8,14	236:10,14 245:14	206:25	145:6 198:14	260:24
extra 78:12 143:3	fans 272:9	245:19 246:1,4,11	fits 204:24	follow-on 205:25	four 73:12 74:25
221:1	far 12:13 20:25 37:11	246:13 247:13	five 3:6 115:12 134:7	follow-up 26:9 94:12	103:12 108:3
extract 56:6,8	43:5 66:22 71:16	248:16 252:25	175:9 221:2 243:24	footnotes 208:6	144:11 207:2,25
extracted 130:2	102:14 110:25	253:2 260:13 261:2	fix 4:3 13:24 14:11	forbid 35:20	250:25
extraordinary 173:3	131:12,13 153:20	261:11	42:10 160:24	force 50:14 177:25	fourth 4:5 61:7 69:14
179:10	161:16 166:25	finality 173:2 174:17	fixed 13:21 16:2 17:22	178:7 180:2 182:20	74:14 130:24
extravagantly 188:9		177:13 189:16	58:20 59:21 61:3	184:12,16,22	175:20 260:3
extra-Treaty 136:23	178:2 182:22 194:2	finally 4:8 61:24 69:14	62:18 82:16 89:21	forced 165:19	frame 234:24 236:4
extreme 158:4	200:16 255:22,24	83:21 126:18	106:25 127:7	forecast 114:1,7,13	framed 189:14
	Farooq 6:10 18:8				
	1		1	1	

framework 2:25 19:18	furiously 26:23	51:25 130:8 218:4	75:9 81:19 99:3	178:24 186:12	hat 208:24
112:6 175:11 180:4	further 11:25 18:25	generator 30:7 50:16	100:3 102:2 109:3	188:7 225:10	haul 142:9
202:9 204:25	21:20 67:14 79:11	generic 221:13	109:16 116:11	228:21 237:6	having 18:9,17 24:22
211:15 216:5,7	90:5 93:19 98:17	generosity 95:2	137:12,13 138:22	246:13	36:15 105:21 109:6
		132:14		grounded 181:16	
227:17 259:10	105:5 113:3 118:14		139:25 150:14		123:19 130:24
framing 27:11,13	121:16 122:3,9	generous 24:9 259:16	159:5 162:17,18	groundwork 252:16	180:25 183:3
207:6 211:3 234:20	132:4 133:7 137:5,6	Genocide 169:8 181:8	178:12 205:3	gruel 115:24	204:17 226:24
free 17:25 18:13 19:8	142:3 154:22	genuinely 179:4	219:12 221:17	guarantee 30:10 55:25	232:14 247:1,17
33:19 72:15 116:13	166:16 179:23	geographically 133:15	232:6,14 234:19	124:3	Hayat 19:3
116:18 147:6 149:7	185:18 201:10	geological 163:20	237:24,25 239:5	guaranteed 54:19,22	head 7:11 50:11,24
150:23 160:22	202:20 204:15	geology 19:17 227:25	242:8 246:20	55:22	51:15 219:6 229:25
164:7 165:10	205:5 206:18	Georgina 1:23	249:17 251:22	guarantees 54:10	256:10
178:11 204:12	240:12,14 250:25	gets 133:14 167:14	252:24 253:18	guess 90:9 115:3	heading 241:7
212:18 213:1 266:2	251:15,19 253:18	214:23	258:7,25 260:6	139:20	headline 129:24
freeboard 18:22 29:11	258:15 265:5 268:7	getting 16:9 95:7	God 35:20	guidance 178:24	219:15 243:8
33:12 145:3 147:6,7	Furthermore 35:9	98:11 110:3 231:8	goes 16:18 120:22	184:5 190:18 192:2	248:24
149:3,11,12,14,18	future 61:1 112:22	245:6	124:25 159:24	192:4,9,11,19	headrace 148:19
152:2 154:5 155:19	113:22 114:1	get-go 222:7	235:12 236:2,14	194:22 200:23	headroom 106:20
		0 0	255:24		
155:21,24 157:9	118:16 174:20	ghost 232:18		241:24 244:5,17 249:25	head-on 264:9
160:20,21,24 161:1	181:3,23 182:6,24	gigantic 153:12	gone 32:17 208:7		hear 26:22 99:7
164:5 165:9	184:15 187:18	give 1:19 27:18 58:23	210:21 233:19	guideline 263:14	253:22 256:21
freedom 186:11	201:17 221:24	82:7 102:1 104:24	good 1:10,20 32:20	guiding 59:6	heard 14:6 159:13
frequency 74:9 75:19	225:14 248:14	105:24 112:5	49:9 72:2 91:7	Gulland 1:23	198:2 210:19
frequent 44:25	250:19	113:10 114:5	101:2 112:10	guru 263:2	216:14 217:2,4
frequently 108:11		115:24 128:20	140:10 167:7 168:9	gutted 118:9	219:10,11,11 220:7
188:21 202:2	G	129:19 130:1	178:23 195:10,19	Guyana 169:9	223:2,10 227:20
fresh 196:5	g 1:1 67:10 169:22	133:21 134:7	219:23,24 226:1		228:24 232:7 261:8
Friday 1:6 1:1 9:20	176:13 183:10	141:15 151:16	251:22 252:15	Н	hearing 1:7 1:4 3:15
10:3	197:4 210:3 218:20	164:2 165:23	254:19 256:1 263:5	Hague 1:5	70:8 71:6 152:13
friend 144:2	241:16 242:9 252:7	185:16 186:18	270:17 272:3,7,10	halcyon 206:11	173:19 235:23
friends 37:18 38:6		204:3,24 205:5	Google 265:8	half 43:20 87:11,12	236:9 246:7,15
255:10	Gaja 187:9	206:18 217:18	govern 106:23 119:17	· · · ·	247:3 257:22 266:6
frivolous 174:19	gaps 89:3	229:10,21 235:5	grand 215:1	94:14 145:20 157:5	268:4,8 269:23
front 90:21 93:7	GARTH 2:19	-	0	Hall 206:4	
	gate 156:7	237:11 239:19	grant 10:16	halved 51:17	270:12,20,22
245:16	gated 147:1,3 150:17	241:23 244:4	granular 214:15	HAMDIA 2:7	271:10 272:12
fuel 30:8	150:21 152:3	251:18 254:15	244:19 254:10	Hameedullah 8:20	hearings 173:19
fulfil 189:8	157:11 164:13	255:7,13 257:24	255:13,18 267:20	hand 45:9 47:15 58:11	heart 243:25
fulfilling 106:16	gates 149:6 152:4	260:19 262:10	granularity 255:19,24	105:2	heavily 208:19,20
full 5:18,24 6:4 28:4	154:11 157:12	266:3 267:21	256:1	Handbook 8:11	heavy 243:13
28:11,18 29:9 33:3	gateways 202:10,13	268:17	graphical 60:14	handed 178:12	height 146:10 149:11
33:10 35:25 64:23	202:14	given 4:25 7:5 10:25	112:17	handing 204:21,22	155:21,22 157:9
100:1 107:16		12:8 14:22 15:3	graphically 68:18	206:12	161:1 162:19,20
	σ_{ave} / / × τ_{av} /				
125:24 132:6	gave 17:17,18 35:7 38:11 270:20		grapple 231:9 237:22		
	38:11 270:20	25:25 29:4 34:5,21	grapple 231:9 237:22 grateful 13:17 140:23	hands 228:11 238:2	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21
138:10 142:25	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11	grateful 13:17 140:23	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18	$\begin{array}{c} 25:25 \ 29:4 \ 34:5,21 \\ 40:3,14,25 \ 44:11 \\ 46:22 \ 48:16,20 \\ 54:18 \ 56:24 \ 61:2 \\ 69:17 \ 73:23 \ 74:2 \\ 81:1,4,7,18 \ 83:10 \\ 83:17 \ 84:6,11 \ 86:12 \\ 88:18 \ 91:25 \ 93:2,24 \\ 108:19 \ 114:9 \\ 118:18 \ 121:25 \\ 130:11 \ 132:2,4 \end{array}$	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1 161:20 191:6,10,12
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15	$\begin{array}{c} 25:25 \ 29:4 \ 34:5,21 \\ 40:3,14,25 \ 44:11 \\ 46:22 \ 48:16,20 \\ 54:18 \ 56:24 \ 61:2 \\ 69:17 \ 73:23 \ 74:2 \\ 81:1,4,7,18 \ 83:10 \\ 83:17 \ 84:6,11 \ 86:12 \\ 88:18 \ 91:25 \ 93:2,24 \\ 108:19 \ 114:9 \\ 118:18 \ 121:25 \\ 130:11 \ 132:2,4 \end{array}$	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1 161:20 191:6,10,12
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1 161:20 191:6,10,12 204:15 257:23
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 154:16	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1 161:20 191:6,10,12 204:15 257:23 258:22 261:10
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3	$\begin{array}{c} 25:25 \ 29:4 \ 34:5,21 \\ 40:3,14,25 \ 44:11 \\ 46:22 \ 48:16,20 \\ 54:18 \ 56:24 \ 61:2 \\ 69:17 \ 73:23 \ 74:2 \\ 81:1,4,7,18 \ 83:10 \\ 83:17 \ 84:6,11 \ 86:12 \\ 88:18 \ 91:25 \ 93:2,24 \\ 108:19 \ 114:9 \\ 118:18 \ 121:25 \\ 130:11 \ 132:2,4 \\ 147:12 \ 149:15 \\ 150:16 \ 154:16 \\ 156:5 \ 157:4 \ 163:25 \end{array}$	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1 161:20 191:6,10,12 204:15 257:23 258:22 261:10 265:15 267:16
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20	$\begin{array}{c} 25:25\ 29:4\ 34:5,21\\ 40:3,14,25\ 44:11\\ 46:22\ 48:16,20\\ 54:18\ 56:24\ 61:2\\ 69:17\ 73:23\ 74:2\\ 81:1,4,7,18\ 83:10\\ 83:17\ 84:6,11\ 86:12\\ 88:18\ 91:25\ 93:2,24\\ 108:19\ 114:9\\ 118:18\ 121:25\\ 130:11\ 132:2,4\\ 147:12\ 149:15\\ 150:16\ 154:16\\ 156:5\ 157:4\ 163:25\\ 167:6,14\ 183:17\\ \end{array}$	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1 161:20 191:6,10,12 204:15 257:23 258:22 261:10 265:15 267:16 268:19 271:13 helps 96:15 142:3
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17	$\begin{array}{c} 25:25\ 29:4\ 34:5,21\\ 40:3,14,25\ 44:11\\ 46:22\ 48:16,20\\ 54:18\ 56:24\ 61:2\\ 69:17\ 73:23\ 74:2\\ 81:1,4,7,18\ 83:10\\ 83:17\ 84:6,11\ 86:12\\ 88:18\ 91:25\ 93:2,24\\ 108:19\ 114:9\\ 118:18\ 121:25\\ 130:11\ 132:2,4\\ 147:12\ 149:15\\ 150:16\ 154:16\\ 156:5\ 157:4\ 163:25\\ 167:6,14\ 183:17\\ 196:9\ 224:2\ 268:16\\ 269:23\ 271:3,5\\ \end{array}$	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1 161:20 191:6,10,12 204:15 257:23 258:22 261:10 265:15 267:16 268:19 271:13 helps 96:15 142:3 HEPs 3:4 4:24 11:10
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25 106:16,19 107:8,11	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17 212:9,10,18,21,23	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 157:4 163:25 167:6,14 183:17 196:9 224:2 268:16 269:23 271:3,5 gives 36:16 73:12	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16 129:16,20	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22 hard 12:19 42:25	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1 161:20 191:6,10,12 204:15 257:23 258:22 261:10 265:15 267:16 268:19 271:13 helps 96:15 142:3 HEPs 3:4 4:24 11:10 11:13 22:21 25:6
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25 106:16,19 107:8,11 130:14 150:7	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17 212:9,10,18,21,23 218:12	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 157:4 163:25 167:6,14 183:17 196:9 224:2 268:16 269:23 271:3,5 gives 36:16 73:12 129:23 134:17	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16 129:16,20 green 155:5	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22 hard 12:19 42:25 90:21	$\begin{array}{c} 163:13\ 165:6\\ \textbf{held}\ 22:24\ 59:7\ 67:21\\ 157:16\\ \textbf{Hello}\ 31:18\\ \textbf{help}\ 103:2\ 190:11\\ 203:24\ 253:22\\ 259:1\ 264:23\ 266:3\\ 267:21\\ \textbf{helpful}\ 1:19\ 62:9\\ 81:16\ 101:1\ 103:1\\ 161:20\ 191:6,10,12\\ 204:15\ 257:23\\ 258:22\ 261:10\\ 265:15\ 267:16\\ 268:19\ 271:13\\ \textbf{helps}\ 96:15\ 142:3\\ \textbf{HEPs}\ 3:4\ 4:24\ 11:10\\ 11:13\ 22:21\ 25:6\\ 35:10\ 36:15\ 50:17\\ \end{array}$
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25 106:16,19 107:8,11 130:14 150:7 180:23 189:8	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17 212:9,10,18,21,23 218:12 generated 76:1 99:13	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 154:16 156:5 157:4 163:25 167:6,14 183:17 196:9 224:2 268:16 269:23 271:3,5 gives 36:16 73:12 129:23 134:17 154:17 262:17	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16 129:16,20 green 155:5 GREGORY 2:13	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22 hard 12:19 42:25 90:21 harder 33:21 45:3	$\begin{array}{c} 163:13\ 165:6\\ \textbf{held}\ 22:24\ 59:7\ 67:21\\ 157:16\\ \textbf{Hello}\ 31:18\\ \textbf{help}\ 103:2\ 190:11\\ 203:24\ 253:22\\ 259:1\ 264:23\ 266:3\\ 267:21\\ \textbf{helpful}\ 1:19\ 62:9\\ 81:16\ 101:1\ 103:1\\ 161:20\ 191:6,10,12\\ 204:15\ 257:23\\ 258:22\ 261:10\\ 265:15\ 267:16\\ 268:19\ 271:13\\ \textbf{helps}\ 96:15\ 142:3\\ \textbf{HEPs}\ 3:4\ 4:24\ 11:10\\ 11:13\ 22:21\ 25:6\\ 35:10\ 36:15\ 50:17\\ 63:23\ 65:22\ 106:14\\ \end{array}$
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25 106:16,19 107:8,11 130:14 150:7 180:23 189:8 functional 180:18	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17 212:9,10,18,21,23 218:12 generated 76:1 99:13 generates 112:23	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 154:16 156:5 157:4 163:25 167:6,14 183:17 196:9 224:2 268:16 269:23 271:3,5 gives 36:16 73:12 129:23 134:17 154:17 262:17 giving 80:6 134:18	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16 129:16,20 green 155:5 GREGORY 2:13 grid 8:25 15:25 16:1	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22 hard 12:19 42:25 90:21 harder 33:21 45:3 hardly 109:8	$\begin{array}{c} 163:13\ 165:6\\ \textbf{held}\ 22:24\ 59:7\ 67:21\\ 157:16\\ \textbf{Hello}\ 31:18\\ \textbf{help}\ 103:2\ 190:11\\ 203:24\ 253:22\\ 259:1\ 264:23\ 266:3\\ 267:21\\ \textbf{helpful}\ 1:19\ 62:9\\ 81:16\ 101:1\ 103:1\\ 161:20\ 191:6,10,12\\ 204:15\ 257:23\\ 258:22\ 261:10\\ 265:15\ 267:16\\ 268:19\ 271:13\\ \textbf{helps}\ 96:15\ 142:3\\ \textbf{HEPs}\ 3:4\ 4:24\ 11:10\\ 11:13\ 22:21\ 25:6\\ 35:10\ 36:15\ 50:17\\ 63:23\ 65:22\ 106:14\\ 112:1,5\ 123:20\\ \end{array}$
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25 106:16,19 107:8,11 130:14 150:7 180:23 189:8 functional 180:18 functional 180:18 functioning 152:9	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17 21:9,10,18,21,23 218:12 generated 76:1 99:13 generates 112:23 198:5	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 154:16 156:5 157:4 163:25 167:6,14 183:17 196:9 224:2 268:16 269:23 271:3,5 gives 36:16 73:12 129:23 134:17 154:17 262:17 giving 80:6 134:18 glacial 5:7	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16 129:16,20 green 155:5 GREGORY 2:13 grid 8:25 15:25 16:1 106:14 114:11	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22 hard 12:19 42:25 90:21 harder 33:21 45:3 hardly 109:8 hardship 19:13,14	$\begin{array}{c} 163:13\ 165:6\\ \textbf{held}\ 22:24\ 59:7\ 67:21\\ 157:16\\ \textbf{Hello}\ 31:18\\ \textbf{help}\ 103:2\ 190:11\\ 203:24\ 253:22\\ 259:1\ 264:23\ 266:3\\ 267:21\\ \textbf{helpful}\ 1:19\ 62:9\\ 81:16\ 101:1\ 103:1\\ 161:20\ 191:6,10,12\\ 204:15\ 257:23\\ 258:22\ 261:10\\ 265:15\ 267:16\\ 268:19\ 271:13\\ \textbf{helps}\ 96:15\ 142:3\\ \textbf{HEPs}\ 3:4\ 4:24\ 11:10\\ 11:13\ 22:21\ 25:6\\ 35:10\ 36:15\ 50:17\\ 63:23\ 65:22\ 106:14\\ 112:1,5\ 123:20\\ 124:5\ 132:15\\ \end{array}$
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25 106:16,19 107:8,11 130:14 150:7 180:23 189:8 functional 180:18 functioning 152:9 functus 251:21 253:3	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17 212:9,10,18,21,23 218:12 generated 76:1 99:13 generates 112:23 198:5 generating 7:11 8:24	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 154:16 156:5 157:4 163:25 167:6,14 183:17 196:9 224:2 268:16 269:23 271:3,5 gives 36:16 73:12 129:23 134:17 154:17 262:17 giving 80:6 134:18 glacial 5:7 global 261:15 262:6	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16 129:16,20 green 155:5 GREGORY 2:13 grid 8:25 15:25 16:1 106:14 114:11 229:17,21 230:2	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22 hard 12:19 42:25 90:21 harder 33:21 45:3 hardly 109:8 hardship 19:13,14 harmonise 41:6	163:13 165:6 held 22:24 59:7 67:21 157:16 Hello 31:18 help 103:2 190:11 203:24 253:22 259:1 264:23 266:3 267:21 helpful 1:19 62:9 81:16 101:1 103:1 161:20 191:6,10,12 204:15 257:23 258:22 261:10 265:15 267:16 268:19 271:13 helps 96:15 142:3 HEPs 3:4 4:24 11:10 11:13 22:21 25:6 35:10 36:15 50:17 63:23 65:22 106:14 112:1,5 123:20 124:5 132:15 133:16 165:17
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25 106:16,19 107:8,11 130:14 150:7 180:23 189:8 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17 212:9,10,18,21,23 218:12 generated 76:1 99:13 generates 112:23 198:5 generating 7:11 8:24 9:2 50:11,24 51:15	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 154:16 156:5 157:4 163:25 167:6,14 183:17 196:9 224:2 268:16 269:23 271:3,5 gives 36:16 73:12 129:23 134:17 154:17 26:17 giving 80:6 134:18 glacial 5:7 global 261:15 262:6 go 14:21 15:23 17:16	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16 129:16,20 green 155:5 GREGORY 2:13 grid 8:25 15:25 16:1 106:14 114:11 229:17,21 230:2 233:7	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22 hard 12:19 42:25 90:21 harder 33:21 45:3 hardly 109:8 hardship 19:13,14 harmonise 41:6 Harvard 35:14 118:7	$\begin{array}{c} 163:13\ 165:6\\ \textbf{held}\ 22:24\ 59:7\ 67:21\\ 157:16\\ \textbf{Hello}\ 31:18\\ \textbf{help}\ 103:2\ 190:11\\ 203:24\ 253:22\\ 259:1\ 264:23\ 266:3\\ 267:21\\ \textbf{helpful}\ 1:19\ 62:9\\ 81:16\ 101:1\ 103:1\\ 161:20\ 191:6,10,12\\ 204:15\ 257:23\\ 258:22\ 261:10\\ 265:15\ 267:16\\ 268:19\ 271:13\\ \textbf{helps}\ 96:15\ 142:3\\ \textbf{HEPs}\ 3:4\ 4:24\ 11:10\\ 11:13\ 22:21\ 25:6\\ 35:10\ 36:15\ 50:17\\ 63:23\ 65:22\ 106:14\\ 112:1,5\ 123:20\\ 124:5\ 132:15\\ 133:16\ 165:17\\ 222:23,25\ 223:1,7\\ \end{array}$
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25 106:16,19 107:8,11 130:14 150:7 180:23 189:8 functional 180:18 functional 180:18 functional 180:18 functional 129:12 213:6 231:7	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17 212:9,10,18,21,23 218:12 generated 76:1 99:13 generates 112:23 198:5 generating 7:11 8:24 9:2 50:11,24 51:15 103:18 256:10	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 154:16 156:5 157:4 163:25 167:6,14 183:17 196:9 224:2 268:16 269:23 271:3,5 gives 36:16 73:12 129:23 134:17 154:17 262:17 giving 80:6 134:18 glacial 5:7 global 261:15 262:6 go 14:21 15:23 17:16 21:5 38:22 43:7	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16 129:16,20 green 155:5 GREGORY 2:13 grid 8:25 15:25 16:1 106:14 114:11 229:17,21 230:2 233:7 grim 35:11 132:17	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22 hard 12:19 42:25 90:21 harder 33:21 45:3 hardly 109:8 hardship 19:13,14 harmonise 41:6 Harvard 35:14 118:7 hasten 152:7	$\begin{array}{c} 163:13\ 165:6\\ \textbf{held}\ 22:24\ 59:7\ 67:21\\ 157:16\\ \textbf{Hello}\ 31:18\\ \textbf{help}\ 103:2\ 190:11\\ 203:24\ 253:22\\ 259:1\ 264:23\ 266:3\\ 267:21\\ \textbf{helpful}\ 1:19\ 62:9\\ 81:16\ 101:1\ 103:1\\ 161:20\ 191:6,10,12\\ 204:15\ 257:23\\ 258:22\ 261:10\\ 265:15\ 267:16\\ 268:19\ 271:13\\ \textbf{helps}\ 96:15\ 142:3\\ \textbf{HEPs}\ 3:4\ 4:24\ 11:10\\ 11:13\ 22:21\ 25:6\\ 35:10\ 36:15\ 50:17\\ 63:23\ 65:22\ 106:14\\ 112:1,5\ 123:20\\ 124:5\ 132:15\\ 133:16\ 165:17\\ 222:23,25\ 223:1,7\\ 223:13,16\ 226:25\\ \end{array}$
138:10 142:25 147:7,18 149:6 152:2 153:8,25 155:7 157:10 160:23 161:3 162:18 163:8 164:8 164:14 165:10 175:5 177:11 225:8 266:6 fullest 241:23 fully 151:16 174:7 175:20 177:6 246:13 261:24 fulsome 187:18 225:6 function 13:9 37:4 77:8 91:16 93:25 106:16,19 107:8,11 130:14 150:7 180:23 189:8 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9 functioning 152:9	38:11 270:20 general 2:6,19 15:15 15:16 23:14 53:25 57:1 63:2 118:25 119:2,6 126:25 171:8 176:11 183:16,19,23 188:12 219:20 240:6,15 255:22 258:11 271:18 generally 3:13 4:15 53:21 67:7 117:15 203:16 generate 5:16 16:3 73:19,24 74:12 75:3 76:20 102:20 103:21 127:17 212:9,10,18,21,23 218:12 generated 76:1 99:13 generates 112:23 198:5 generating 7:11 8:24 9:2 50:11,24 51:15	25:25 29:4 34:5,21 40:3,14,25 44:11 46:22 48:16,20 54:18 56:24 61:2 69:17 73:23 74:2 81:1,4,7,18 83:10 83:17 84:6,11 86:12 88:18 91:25 93:2,24 108:19 114:9 118:18 121:25 130:11 132:2,4 147:12 149:15 150:16 154:16 156:5 157:4 163:25 167:6,14 183:17 196:9 224:2 268:16 269:23 271:3,5 gives 36:16 73:12 129:23 134:17 154:17 26:17 giving 80:6 134:18 glacial 5:7 global 261:15 262:6 go 14:21 15:23 17:16	grateful 13:17 140:23 143:8 272:2 gravity 50:14 154:7 256:11 great 57:19 206:4 209:4 267:25 greater 10:17 18:10 34:18,21 36:16 49:22,24 69:21 83:16,17 87:8,8 88:6 95:14 107:7,15 165:20,23,24 224:10,11 greatest 79:7 80:25 84:8 93:4,9 102:11 120:10 122:16 129:16,20 green 155:5 GREGORY 2:13 grid 8:25 15:25 16:1 106:14 114:11 229:17,21 230:2 233:7	hands 228:11 238:2 hang 90:14 happen 33:9 78:8 115:7 138:24 254:19 happened 37:14 127:21 happens 48:6 75:4 76:22 78:15 85:5 86:8 95:6 102:21 133:19 224:14 235:20 Happily 50:5 happy 17:14 32:5 58:12 90:23 139:12 195:16 202:20 256:21,22 hard 12:19 42:25 90:21 harder 33:21 45:3 hardly 109:8 hardship 19:13,14 harmonise 41:6 Harvard 35:14 118:7	$\begin{array}{c} 163:13\ 165:6\\ \textbf{held}\ 22:24\ 59:7\ 67:21\\ 157:16\\ \textbf{Hello}\ 31:18\\ \textbf{help}\ 103:2\ 190:11\\ 203:24\ 253:22\\ 259:1\ 264:23\ 266:3\\ 267:21\\ \textbf{helpful}\ 1:19\ 62:9\\ 81:16\ 101:1\ 103:1\\ 161:20\ 191:6,10,12\\ 204:15\ 257:23\\ 258:22\ 261:10\\ 265:15\ 267:16\\ 268:19\ 271:13\\ \textbf{helps}\ 96:15\ 142:3\\ \textbf{HEPs}\ 3:4\ 4:24\ 11:10\\ 11:13\ 22:21\ 25:6\\ 35:10\ 36:15\ 50:17\\ 63:23\ 65:22\ 106:14\\ 112:1,5\ 123:20\\ 124:5\ 132:15\\ 133:16\ 165:17\\ 222:23,25\ 223:1,7\\ \end{array}$

Trevor McGowan

Page 10

HEP's 5:12,15 6:6,17	78:10,17,20 79:7,8	I	important 16:21	162:20 165:5,9	industry 8:10 131:12
7:10,22 8:6 13:22	79:17 80:3,12 81:8		20:21 31:1,3 33:7	increases 68:15 70:18	inevitable 214:22
13:24 18:11,16,17	82:2,6,6,7,9,10,13	Ian 183:22	34:12 48:10 64:11	increasing 162:18,19	inevitably 75:19 111:1
19:3 20:14 27:21		ICJ 169:13 176:12	69:5 70:15 73:12	increments 17:6	inferred 183:15
	84:14 86:11,14,15	181:7,20 184:4			
29:11 39:11,14 41:5	86:22,23,24,25 87:4	185:12,22 199:3	79:12 116:7 122:12	incur 17:25	inflection 89:8,19
50:16 51:5 54:12,16	87:10,13,15,16,24	206:5	137:4 138:1 141:4	indeed 15:19 18:21	102:10
58:2 61:4 78:7	87:25 88:2,3,4,5,11	idea 25:16 93:16 94:9	144:15 209:14	35:12 36:8 39:3	inflow 7:24 39:16
84:15 107:7 110:2,4	89:24 91:14,15	ideas 42:23	212:15 213:11	46:1 68:17 79:24	40:15 77:23 81:7,18
120:17 121:25	100:6,9,19 102:6	identification 240:6	215:9 216:22	92:19 107:14,20	81:19,24 82:1,4,6
127:11 143:24	104:7,7,8 105:20,21	identified 58:8 196:11	234:19 236:11	113:23 118:20	82:12,14,20 84:6
her 14:7 59:17	107:5,17 110:23	241:20 242:10	237:3 252:19 262:6	128:14 133:24	86:16,25 87:14,16
Hersch 187:3	111:2 125:14,16	262:20	264:1	138:5 140:22 170:4	89:24 93:8 95:14
hesitates 117:2	126:14,17 127:18	identify 94:12 216:14	importantly 60:17	170:10 194:11	100:7 102:13 107:6
hesitating 232:13	128:23 130:7,25,25		61:24	201:25 228:17	107:15 122:15,21
hesitation 173:17	131:10,10 132:6	218:21 223:13	impose 35:21	241:18 260:9	123:5 125:9,15,19
hidden 56:5	136:15,16 146:6	226:24	imposed 152:15 165:8	263:21	125:23 128:1
Higgins 188:11	233:14	idle 119:24	imposes 25:2 42:24	independence 172:1	inflows 82:17
high 4:19 5:9 8:5	housed 153:13	ignore 129:4	69:21	Indian 1:15 25:1 27:3	influence 15:9 16:11
0		ii 47:13 61:22 66:13			62:3 161:1
92:11 97:2 121:23	housekeeping 207:22	66:25 110:20 135:6	impossible 161:19	38:6,12 105:17	
146:23 150:24	253:6 261:12	136:22 138:5	impounding 162:25	106:20 149:24	influenced 209:6
153:20 156:16	265:17	215:18 216:6	impoundment 162:6	160:24 161:14	236:20
163:25	huge 233:2 234:5	217:22 248:6 251:6	impression 209:2	223:21 233:7	inform 226:12 227:23
higher 8:4 9:9 10:8	250:22 254:22	iii 20:19,21 21:14,21	258:23	236:22 261:16,18	240:5
15:2 18:5 33:12	humans 9:16	23:18 27:11 36:23	impressionistically	262:3,3 263:12,13	information 33:1
83:1 88:12 95:9,10	hundreds 13:12	37:16 69:20 119:21	161:10	263:18,21,24	47:14,24 61:22
95:14 123:5 148:17	253:17	122:3 129:3,19,23	improper 192:10	India's 3:4 4:5 7:7,15	80:21 136:21
151:24,25 157:3,7	hybrid 200:10 201:1	211:3,15 213:18	improvement 154:2	22:17 24:7 25:3,9	140:14 224:18,22
highest 92:3 146:15	hydraulic 227:15	214:5 215:18 216:6	improvements 227:15	27:9 35:25 36:14	225:5,9 254:11,14
highlight 44:4	hydraulics 220:12	217:22 241:3 247:8	inalienable 129:24	37:2 38:2,14 41:7	258:20
highlighting 45:18	221:3	248:23 250:2 251:8	inapposite 183:2	43:11 46:3 56:8,19	information-sharing
highlights 124:21	hydro 16:22 30:8		inaudible 159:6	57:8 64:13 69:18	227:6
140:10	142:20 216:3	III(1) 20:24 22:1	incentive 34:6	71:19 86:2 96:23	informative 90:6,8
high-school 52:10,11	217:23 218:23	34:23	inch 153:12 155:7	97:4 99:7 107:25	informed 31:23
high-water 117:7	219:17 247:24	III(2) 41:9 109:20	include 48:1 159:10	109:18 111:21	208:19,19,20
him 15:1 130:11	hydroelectric 21:19	111:20	171:18 176:14	113:11,19 116:21	209:25 234:10
	•	III(2)(d) 21:18 212:21			
141:14,15,16	22:18 50:8 53:23	212:22	198:3 202:21	117:7,12,17,23	258:13,14 259:10
224:17,23 245:24	70:11 113:24	III(4) 21:22 22:1,10	included 47:10,23	122:6,24 125:7,18	informs 232:18
255:3	114:12 115:1 144:2	24:25 58:7 109:21	149:24 178:20	126:13,25 127:19	infra 176:25 183:20
Himalayan 4:24 10:17	212:9,11 220:18	Iliff 217:8	198:7 228:8	131:14 134:13	ingenious 6:7 152:13
Himalayas 261:22	239:14	illuminating 258:10	includes 22:3 138:15	143:18 144:4,6	ingress 157:8
hinge 174:12	hydrograph 5:2,14	illustrate 96:16	138:17 149:15	145:15 154:1,2	initial 27:19 100:3
hinging 233:3,4,5	hydrological 84:12	175:17	196:16 227:13	160:2,17,20 161:9	102:1 119:19 122:7
historical 46:13,24	88:8 94:15 95:11	illustrated 177:18	256:9	162:2,8 163:11	133:12 134:1
48:13,17 105:9	102:23 106:1	image 147:15	including 8:25 76:4,9	164:4,6 165:16	205:24 227:3
110:19	109:23	imagine 95:23 207:24	108:14 120:17	166:1 173:8 187:20	262:11 268:17
history 21:15 24:14	hydrology 15:4 16:2	208:7 227:21	176:18 177:9	211:22 212:6,8	initially 245:3 267:1
172:5 174:1 187:21	19:16 23:21 61:3	208:7 227:21 254:25	189:12 194:23	215:12 218:3,11	initiated 228:6
hit 20:21	91:24 92:4,18 96:19		206:4 220:5 227:11	219:4,5 222:10,15	initio 14:12
hold 159:12 222:3,5	97:4,10 101:22	immediate 148:1	261:13 264:22	222:23 229:14	injunctive 176:3
holding 169:14	104:3,21 113:19	159:13	inclusion 189:14	231:5 232:3 236:21	Innovation 227:11
hold-alls 249:21	145:25 228:1 229:5	immediately 35:2	income 18:3	236:23 237:7 238:6	innovations 220:12,14
honoured 168:21	229:13 231:6,25	42:22 141:11 199:9	incompatibility	238:7,11,22 264:7	input 61:8 112:25
hope 1:15 4:9 42:6	232:10,22 233:9	254:19 256:15	180:22	indicate 70:5	135:4
44:4 142:25 173:21	hydropower 8:10 9:5	immensely 240:9	incompletely 260:10	indicated 44:13 175:3	inputs 57:23
		impact 41:13			-
199:3 201:12 221:9	11:15 37:21 52:17	impart 189:16	inconsistent 180:8	266:6	inside 205:14
224:20 236:2	53:4 111:21 114:10	impediment 13:14	182:1	indicates 56:7 95:1	insight 15:6 25:7
238:13 250:6	212:19,22,23	impediments 188:6	incorporate 18:16	159:23	insisting 165:18,22
254:18 255:18	214:20 215:13	imperative 61:4	incorporated 114:11	indicating 148:19	insists 56:23
272:3	218:3,12 227:11	Imperial 210:9	197:24 198:23	149:5 192:6	insofar 22:13 25:9
hopefully 1:21 16:19	hydro-electric 24:19	impermissible 42:4	incorporation 171:9	indication 58:24 59:15	38:5 122:6 160:16
71:10 100:24	44:19 50:3	154:23	194:6	185:16 267:17	235:21 260:11
host 199:6	hydro-oriented	implemented 68:10	incorrect 59:16 122:9	indicator 213:11	270:6
hour 53:3,5,6	256:14	implicitly 19:1 178:22	137:22	individual 10:14	install 104:1
hours 5:18 6:1 11:3,18	hypothesis 115:23	imply 100:8	increase 62:5 88:23	63:17 112:25	installed 5:16 6:3,17
11:19,20 12:8 13:3	hypothetical 180:15	import 172:16	89:7 111:4 126:17	inducing 92:7	7:7 8:6 10:23 15:24
13:4 18:4 48:23	201:20,20 233:5	import 172:16	162:16 165:6 166:1	Indus 1:2 2:4 6:21	16:4,16 50:1 54:13
53:4 54:19 56:24	239:18	-	increased 33:8 128:6	19:22 38:9 129:7	54:16 57:6 58:3
73:10 77:16,18 78:6	H.E 2:6	66:3 185:3 216:14 223:17	128:7 130:8 161:11	147:17 222:13	103:22,25 106:15
,		223:17			· · · · · ·

	-	-			
107:8 120:17	interfere 27:10 211:23	interrupt 55:4 264:23	203:12,13,14,19	KC 2:9,11	knowledge 200:16
121:22 122:1	214:6 226:6	interrupting 107:23	207:5,22 209:5	keen 137:12	268:25
125:17,25 126:2	interference 21:8	interruption 47:22	211:9,10,11 222:10	keep 107:9 133:19,20	known 31:17 36:1
127:11 131:11,19	65:14 69:7 212:7	interruptions 44:25	225:4 234:11	133:20 134:5	76:25 80:17,17
131:24 229:6,12	213:16,17,23 214:8	intersecting 28:18	238:13,20,23	140:19 141:15	81:22
230:1 233:4	214:18 225:18,19	intertwined 177:2	240:22 243:15	keeping 33:18 69:12	knows 238:6 240:14
instance 190:13	225:21 226:3,9	194:3	244:14 245:5 247:5	150:22	263:14
instances 67:23	interim 200:2 228:9	inter-state 199:22	248:4,19 250:15,16	keeps 97:16	
222:24	228:13	252:6	251:13 255:19	kept 18:13 110:13	L
instant 185:25	interjected 141:1	introduced 32:10	258:13 260:15,22	124:6	L 2:13
instantaneous 54:3,6	intermediate 11:6,6	introduces 130:7,25	263:3 265:17	key 20:22 24:15,25	lack 74:9 129:1
54:12,13,24 55:6,12	11:18 12:15 13:4	introducing 16:20	270:10	25:7 27:16 41:3	Lafitte 119:5 120:19
55:14,24 75:13,16	104:7,14,18	97:12	issuing 252:4	52:13 179:20	122:8,22 123:8,12
75:17 76:1,8,17	international 45:14	introduction 8:15	iv 249:2	223:13	124:9,15 126:20
instantaneously 52:24	147:8 169:7,24	42:6 118:17 151:5	ix 1:1 192:24 202:4	Khan 2:5 10:19 11:16	127:3,22 128:12,18
136:4	176:8 177:5,19	introductory 13:19	203:2,23 204:23	Khan's 8:20 12:3 50:6	129:15 130:4
instead 130:12 203:25	179:2 180:20,24	invariably 44:23 47:5	205:19 249:20	KHEP 163:5 239:10	131:18 153:19
223:1 266:10	184:16 187:23	57:5 166:20	IX(1) 182:11 202:11	239:13 243:16,20	154:3 155:20
Instinctively 202:8	188:11,24 192:5	investigate 151:11	I(15) 69:6 213:21	kick 254:12	161:22 261:3
instruct 263:23	195:2 200:9	invitation 173:9	I(15)(b) 65:13	kicks 255:21	Lafitte's 118:11
instructive 71:3	interplay 209:14	invite 225:14 266:12	i.e 46:16	kilograms 50:12	119:14 132:2
instrument 209:13	interpolate 225:24	invoke 109:5		kind 20:12 28:24 31:4	Land 170:18 171:4
255:8	interpret 98:24 173:1	invoking 267:21	J	34:1 49:4,5 56:7	language 21:11 41:23
insufficient 79:14	203:18	involved 3:8 71:4	j 2:14 262:19	113:25 114:22	42:24 43:19 69:4
89:15	interpretation 21:16	197:17 201:13	JAMAL 2:8	140:13 150:17	98:3 101:7,20 191:1
intake 14:4 146:12,18	22:25 24:6 27:7,8	involves 81:3	Jan 170:15 185:14	151:18 156:6	194:21 197:3
148:25 155:10,14	31:2 41:21 42:3	in-between 11:7	January 47:7	158:14 159:9	227:18 231:14
155:15 160:12	59:2,12,15,19 60:4	ipso 61:23 146:24	JEFFREY 1:11	165:25 168:4 174:3	248:1 257:4
163:25 164:2	60:11,25 61:16,21	Iran 199:17	Jhelum 24:10	184:13 193:9 199:8	large 18:8 83:14,22
227:16	66:6 69:23 73:8	Iranian 199:16	joined 200:8	202:2,9 240:16	121:24 129:9 154:7
intakes 14:7 34:13	76:5,6 100:11 104:24 123:23	Iran-US 191:25 199:7 199:13 202:1	journey 27:14	kindly 189:20 kinds 63:3 248:19	157:22 165:6,18
144:18,19 146:7,10 146:15 148:18	143:21,23,25 144:5	iron 49:3	Judge 1:10 177:12	KING 2:20	170:11
151:24 152:1	144:6,19 151:8	irregularity 201:25	186:15 187:9	Kingdom 2:7,8,9	largely 109:10
153:23,24 154:4	171:3 172:23 173:8	irrelevant 67:12	judgment 169:17	Kiru 47:12,20,25	larger 106:15 165:19
155:9 156:13,17	175:2 177:19 179:9	124:19,23 135:23	170:16,16,24 171:4	50:24 51:3 86:3	largest 84:9,13
157:7 160:11	182:10,17 184:21	136:18	177:15,21,22 178:5	89:1 94:17 104:10	laser 148:2
163:24 165:7,20	184:25 189:10	irrespective 44:16	178:7 181:13,17,19 181:22 182:17	104:13,18,24 105:2	last 1:8 95:21 159:1 192:20 193:20
integral 29:1	193:3 194:12,23	75:4 76:21 93:8	184:4,10,12 185:11	106:11 107:25	192.20 193.20
integrity 184:23	198:13 199:1	95:22 102:14	186:12,18 194:11	Kishenganga 22:23	210:20 211:6
189:11	202:12 206:15	109:22 110:25	judgments 170:18	23:7,8,23 24:8,24	232:12
intend 41:13 247:25	208:18 209:23,25	irrigation 6:24	177:14 183:23,25	25:7 51:21 58:9	lasting 177:11 195:4
intended 44:12,14	219:18,21 226:2	irritant 221:15	194:13 200:8	67:21 136:8 150:9	lastly 155:25
103:21 105:8	231:11 232:19	Islamic 1:16 2:2	judicata 169:5,16,19	151:7 154:23 156:3	late 118:11
132:19 140:24	233:16 234:9 235:5	168:22	174:10 181:6,19,24	159:16 167:14	later 90:23 142:5
141:2 150:6 165:11	235:11 237:11	isolation 216:4	182:25 197:21	169:21 172:21	206:8 267:3
175:18 209:19	239:10 241:1,3	issue 15:13 118:4	198:1 203:7 237:21	173:8,12 209:2	latest 169:14 221:3
258:18 259:12,15	242:25 243:5	169:25 181:7	238:17 241:12	222:12 227:2,3	latter 74:23 114:25
263:6 268:20	244:17 247:8	184:19 201:5	judicial 175:19 180:8	228:7,11,13 235:10	171:16 176:4 188:5
intent 61:14 166:3	249:14,25 250:9	208:17 211:3	180:22 181:15	235:14 236:22	Laura 2:12 263:2
217:13	253:1 255:6 258:15	216:13 220:13	182:2,16 183:21	261:4 264:5	Lauterpacht 186:15
intention 73:2 92:14	interpretations	222:21 224:13	186:5,6 187:1,13,13	knife 56:5	187:3
177:23 243:12	143:18 179:23	233:12,15 238:14	July 1:6 1:1	knocked 61:9 151:20	law 45:14 97:19
250:7 251:14	interpretative 170:8	238:19 243:14	jump 102:1	know 1:21 4:15 31:10	142:19 172:15
265:20	192:1 243:7 248:23	244:25 245:8	June 143:12	32:1 57:23,25 58:4	177:24 178:6
inter 176:15 181:16	interpreted 3:19 22:7	251:24 252:18	jurisdiction 180:21	58:10,12 73:6,9	180:24 182:19
interactions 118:4	70:2 75:1 76:19	256:5,25 257:22 261:13,24 262:1	182:15 184:19	74:7 85:1 90:16	184:11,17 188:19
intercede 115:17 interest 25:14 36:14	95:5 121:3 123:24 172:8 208:22	266:13 268:11	jurisdictional 181:8	95:3 96:6 120:14,25 125:4 133:13	194:23 200:5
169:1 254:23	219:14	269:13	183:17	139:24 150:3 159:6	243:25 247:17
261:25	interpreter 27:1,5	issued 203:18	jurisprudence 185:12	161:12 163:25	263:15,17,18
interested 14:22 26:12	59:16 69:17,25	issues 1:6 18:24 45:3	197:23,25	164:23 172:22	265:14
70:7 140:11 166:18	interpreting 99:19	115:18 171:23	justice 175:24 177:19	234:17 238:11	lawyer 208:24 210:8
192:13 262:9	interpretive 58:15	172:3 176:18	179:3 180:21	253:11 264:22	210:10
interesting 119:8	69:24 203:13	179:18 187:15	188:11 192:6 200:9 206:4	266:16 271:23	lawyers 228:15
128:23 209:14	interprets 178:6	188:2 190:17	206:4 Justin 96:4 258:4	272:8	234:13 layering 215:15
interestingly 195:5	184:11	191:22 200:5	JUSUII 70.4 238.4	knowing 80:21,21	laying 252:16
interests 23:21 123:21	interrogation 62:23	201:19 202:18	K	89:22	lead 76:5 168:7
1					

					<u>,</u>
leads 72:20 87:18	letter 72:13 111:15	215:9	loading 11:19,20	lower 9:24 15:3 34:8	151:12 156:9,18
93:20,24 150:19	117:14 139:7,9	limited 11:3 12:25	loadings 104:6	34:10,13 54:16	157:23 160:14,19
155:3 190:14	224:23 253:7	13:1,5 20:4 24:13	loads 29:23 30:23,25	83:25 123:5 149:19	165:12,14 200:1
learning 234:14 263:3	let's 4:12 21:5 42:13	38:12 46:15 110:12	32:11,12 63:8 65:25	154:7 165:21	227:12 251:3
least 6:18 23:3 25:14	72:4 75:9 78:4	111:25 119:24	67:8	167:19 168:7	Manager 2:21
26:2 58:4 59:14	81:18 86:19 87:21	133:15 160:7 260:5	Loans 186:16	lowered 33:15	managing 164:12
66:3 89:13 102:7	119:4 134:9 142:7	limiting 58:6 71:19	located 40:23 52:25	lowering 34:20	mandate 183:17
105:22 139:9,13,18	145:18 147:9 148:3	limits 20:6,7 23:14	144:19,25 146:15	lowest 9:2 34:17 47:4	242:25
139:20 155:25	152:23 194:24	24:9 25:17 37:16	148:18 255:4	48:15,17 101:11,13	mandated 219:19
163:3 190:4 193:21	206:14,15 219:7	41:10,20 152:14	location 39:19 40:12	101:15 105:11	mandates 21:15
195:25 202:16	226:20 267:3	173:4 179:11 187:1	49:7	low-level 35:6 151:6	mangle 232:4
210:3,6,7 213:3	268:23	238:4	locked 5:9	low-season 35:19	manipulate 62:1
238:8 255:20 259:3	let-flow 41:8 109:20	line 5:14,14 14:25	logic 33:25 166:3	lunch 1:15,18 137:11	135:13
leave 141:22 142:7	212:2,3	15:2,8 16:11 35:15	London 2:9,10,10,11	140:17,24 141:11	manner 117:22
185:18 204:9	levels 27:21 28:15	111:10 155:5	2:11,12,12,13	140.17,24 141.11	185:16 189:2 225:6
246:24 271:14	levers 62:4,7	179:24 185:17	long 46:15 77:4 103:4	lurking 201:5	manual 9:6 11:16
leaving 179:21	library 258:2	linear 88:16	130:22 142:9	lui kiig 201.5	52:17 60:14 112:17
left 9:5 12:21 17:12	lie 131:12 216:9	lines 70:25 71:25	160:22 171:24	M	258:23
19:9 28:14,15 57:11	lies 33:2 34:14,17	170:8,20 173:20	180:17 190:24		manually 60:16
57:22 89:4 209:11	lifespan 114:10	187:9 244:3	262:14	made 19:1 20:16	manuals 258:3
209:22 253:7	-	line-up 267:18	longer 2:3 6:25 11:8	21:11 56:7 72:11	
265:16 266:7	lifetime 18:15 114:15 115:9 150:8	lingering 166:7	36:4 48:24 56:2	98:14,17 122:10	many 21:11 57:8
		link 93:23	75:21 76:9 151:3	133:10 152:1	67:23 113:1 152:16
left-hand 13:14	light 122:2 149:25 156:2 169:21	link 93:23 linked 31:7 57:17		173:20 206:10	167:17 169:25
leg 143:7			longitudinal 28:13	207:19 222:17	188:14 197:10
legacy 242:21 legal 2:5,20,20 19:2,4	179:13 211:10 237:8 246:14	91:22,23,23 194:25 lip-service 174:6	32:24 long standing 182:9	223:23 236:25	199:9 206:3 253:11 264:21
19:10,15 119:8	lightly 222:19	Lisa 1:23	long-standing 182:9 look 20:16 35:8 43:14	237:15 239:16	204:21 man-made 65:15
,	0.	list 65:11 66:20 266:1		262:16 269:19,20	214:1,8
170:23 171:1,1 173:10 175:1	like 8:21 14:20 15:20 19:16 20:23 32:21	listened 211:5	63:1 76:1 85:19,20 86:6 96:9 97:1	269:20	margin 20:10 169:10
177:25 178:2,24	35:8 36:20 41:15	lists 68:14	101:10,22 108:12	magnitude 29:19	marginally 49:22
179:18 180:3		literature 76:2 257:13	116:23 138:5 139:4	30:14 42:20 121:1	224:10
	55:18 90:4 95:24	259:23	139:6 142:12	121:13 122:14	
182:21,22 186:20	96:6 97:18 99:7			132:17 226:13	margins 230:23
194:24 208:21	103:18 133:2 148:3	litigation 187:19	147:10 151:15	main 24:10 103:17	maritime 170:11,13
209:15,24 210:5,15	151:15 152:14	little 5:10 11:24 25:14	152:24 156:21,22	163:18	170:16,18 171:4
254:16 255:13	153:6 155:14	32:18 40:10 41:4	157:4 165:1 167:25	maintain 18:7 108:22	mark 29:20 117:7
258:15	156:21,22 157:4	42:13 46:10 47:8,9	192:7,15 201:25	148:22	marked 148:12 153:8
legally 179:1 180:2	165:1 166:13	68:12 76:12 78:2 82:6 0 02:12 12	213:20 219:22,22	maintained 116:25	161:4
legitimate 42:2 182:14	178:10 192:15	83:6,9 93:13,13	219:23,24 221:24	maintaining 155:12	masked 209:11
187:8 lend 173:7	193:8 194:15 195:2	108:4 115:19 140:23 142:21	232:15 245:6 250:22 256:8 259:1	maintains 56:23	MASL 153:9 mass 126:7 128:8
length 46:25 132:25	198:12 199:10 204:10 207:4,8,10	143:2 159:12 163:1	259:9 260:2 261:17	major 19:5 35:21	131:3
lengthy 83:11	207:13 222:18	169:23 190:22	272:4	265:9	massive 6:13
Leonardo 177:12	232:17 237:24		looked 51:21 65:20	make 26:11,20 35:1	massive 0.15 massively 165:5
		192:21,25 197:4	66:22 105:15	37:8 38:1,16 48:6	229:21
less 4:23 6:2,2 10:3	245:11 246:17 262:14 264:24	198:9 199:5 200:10 200:11 14 201:10	213:21 258:12	58:24 65:12 109:10	match 63:12 92:22
11:9,21 12:13 33:20		200:11,14 201:10 207:11 210:21	looking 52:12 89:4	112:10 114:1	155:12
60:1,3 66:11 70:20 71:17 73:23 74:6 22	265:10 266:1,16 267:7,15 268:24		0	115:14 118:14	material 136:23 137:4
71:17 73:23 74:6,22 74:24 79:13 80:14	267:7,15 268:24 270:11,20,23	211:12,24 213:5 214:15 216:10,12	91:1 94:18 95:10 105:9 191:9 192:24	122:2 143:2 154:24	140:11 174:10
		•·- · • · • • • • •		159:9 180:10	150 1 4 150 5
82:20 83:13 87:7 88:13,17 95:12,17	likelihood 140:21 likely 9:7 70:20,22	217:18,19 218:6 220:23 224:5,5,6	195:11 212:16 245:17 248:2	191:14 196:7	178:16 179:7 181:11
102:24 104:8	102:24 114:8	220:23 224:5,5,6 231:13 240:10,10	245:17 248:2 256:16 257:4,6,12	198:20 201:11,16	materially 179:15
102:24 104:8	149:17 150:16	240:14 246:2	259:25 261:15,15	202:6 207:4,8,16	225:23,25 226:5
			-	208:1 216:23	,
121:14 148:15,19	152:11 168:7	254:10 255:17	261:18 262:5	221:20 231:24	materials 236:23
168:7 188:21 211:10 225:9 257:6	174:14 196:21,21 likes 104:2	257:9,22,25 260:3	looks 153:6 154:8	236:15 237:14	mathematics 81:10,11 89:19 103:7
	likewise 23:25 51:23	267:21 269:16	200:17 204:10	238:10 245:18	
259:23 269:10 lot 1:21 21:2 6 42:6	limit 20:13 23:10 24:2	live 25:4 27:25 28:16	lose 142:21 215:10	246:18 249:9	matter 1:1 1:20 15:13
let 1:21 21:3,6 42:6		28:18,22 29:1,19,24 30:11,13 33:2,18,22	loses 214:25	253:10 260:16	27:5 41:6,19 42:23
70:17 85:24 91:2	39:11,13,15 41:22		losing 212:17 lost 213:4.5 216:12	270:2,14	52:6 84:24,25 89:18
111:19 138:6	51:24 122:3 124:7	35:9,18,21 36:16 42:20 51:11,11		makes 20:3 34:25 49:9	95:6 102:19,21
140:25 171:8	133:17 136:10	· · · · · ·	lot 43:12 155:7 213:12	109:8 123:22	103:7 106:21 119:6
176:23 182:5	158:1 limitation 20:17.18	110:5 122:13,18	213:13 216:14 228:24 232:7	128:25 131:20	119:9 122:12 123:22 134:25
189:23 195:2	limitation 30:17,18	123:20 128:9,10		143:15 156:4	
207:25 211:19,19	109:18 121:4,5,12	129:16 133:23	lots 201:1 220:14	making 62:2 114:13	147:3 177:9 181:11
211:23 212:1,6	121:16,21 122:24	136:7 150:23	244:12 267:7	118:2 180:23	185:18 239:25
214:11,18 218:8	123:16 124:2	162:22,24 163:4	low 4:22 7:18 9:8 49:2	Malik 10:19	matters 4:15 51:9
238:4 253:19 256:4	234:25	168:1,4 180:18	49:5,7 94:16 104:21	manage 129:17 158:9	137:1 172:15
262:10 265:18	limitations 11:12 25:1	lives 18:18	104:22 105:15	management 18:14	178:21
271:21	109:6 124:4 129:18	LLP 2:11,12,12,13	108:14 150:1	33:23 150:20 151:4	maximise 34:6 82:19
	1	1			1

88:7,18 126:21	122:13 123:3	mention 38:24 113:6	137:19,20 139:18	149:14,18 155:22	morning's 144:13
maximised 89:17	132:11 155:25	176:20	158:5 159:4 190:5,7	161:23 256:9 262:1	Morris 2:13 3:14
maximises 81:8	160:17 189:15	mentioned 41:14	190:17,23 191:9,15	Ministry 2:4,5 245:21	26:18 34:16 35:7
maximum 3:1 2:1,4,12	190:12 213:23	53:18 55:5 61:22	190:17,23 191:9,13	245:23	155:17 156:22
2:22 3:3,24 4:6,11	214:8 263:25	63:9 89:11 96:3	192.2,10 193.12	minor 83:8	157:17,20 159:7,12
· · · ·	meant 85:10 99:19		203:10 210:8,9,11		165:2,12 208:24
13:20 20:4 23:24		109:17 129:11		minus 88:1	-
24:5 28:5 36:7	100:11 254:5	136:20 138:13	237:7 246:23 257:6	minute 53:3 75:21	216:17 220:11
37:25 42:8,15,18	measure 34:24 59:11	158:24 179:2,9	257:22 266:10	222:7	223:3,11 227:21
55:8 57:24 58:18	75:18,18	184:8 194:16	267:18 268:11,13	minutes 134:7 141:17	254:20
59:12,21 61:2,13	measured 46:19 52:23	200:19 235:18	268:13	143:1 171:12	most 9:16 10:25 19:15
62:5 68:22 69:11	53:5 58:17,19	258:23 264:25	mile 153:12 155:8	267:16	50:17 61:24 90:23
70:13 84:20 85:10	measurement 45:5	mere 182:24 238:1	Miles's 90:17	misapply 130:5	102:17 105:25
85:12,13,15,16	measures 228:9	merely 43:18 55:13	mill 266:20	misguided 117:25	106:14 129:6 177:4
89:25 96:1 98:25	measuring 47:3	61:12 67:7 92:1	million 50:20 81:20	mishear 260:9	187:6 189:15
102:10 106:6,10	mechanical 60:16	104:3 156:25 244:8	82:15 87:1,18 88:9	misheard 260:7	197:25 208:15
111:8 112:13	mechanism 184:22	merits 1:7 1:4 207:7	106:11,18 131:5,7	misread 120:24	224:16 230:16
118:19 120:12	mechanisms 62:2	234:22 235:6,9,12	131:14,16,21 132:4	mission 80:1 122:3	245:23 265:22
121:8 127:22	172:2,6,14 189:12	250:10 253:1	133:4 147:23	misspeak 260:10	mostly 166:18
144:14 161:17	204:17 209:20	merits/reparations	148:14,15 155:3	misspeaking 227:5	motif 194:7
166:11,14,20,23	222:4	192:8	161:6,25 162:5,7	misspoke 260:8	motifs 169:21 170:4
175:1 230:18	meet 8:14,25 9:13,14	met 10:14 64:6,7 69:2	163:1,14	mistake 118:11	174:13 178:17,19
231:15,21	10:2 11:2 29:21,25	94:24	millions 59:22	mistaken 237:6	motion 62:8
maybe 9:21 12:19,24	30:11,14,19 31:7	method 40:5	mind 3:11,23 19:23	misunderstand 130:5	motivated 143:17
31:13 45:2 47:7	56:11 59:13 60:23	methodology 17:22	37:24 53:8 75:10	misunderstands	mountains 5:9
76:12 116:2 150:17	61:5 63:25 65:7	58:25 59:11,20 60:5	77:8 95:25 113:17	123:25	move 38:21 48:10
202:25 203:23	69:1 97:5 105:22	60:13,22,24 61:7,11	116:17 118:6	Mm3 126:18,19	87:21 116:15
260:7,7 262:3 267:1	120:16 121:1,13,16	61:15,25 64:19,24	135:16 174:24	modalities 67:11	162:12 163:23
270:23	122:4,14 123:14	68:9,14 98:5 103:18	196:12 197:19	mode 11:4	234:19 235:15
Mayen 170:15 185:14	131:1 134:20	112:19 113:18	199:9,11 200:7	model 128:16	250:15 251:16
McGowan 1:23	135:15 160:9 165:8	115:6 127:4 140:2,3	203:4 207:24 218:6	moderate 83:19	256:16 267:22
mean 16:2,15 17:1	194:8 265:20	162:2 233:18	222:9 223:16	modern 50:17	268:4
24:2 30:18 31:12	meeting 9:12 56:14	methods 68:10	248:17 255:20	modest 163:5	moved 14:9
37:12 38:5,25 44:1	67:7,8 92:13,25	metre 50:13 149:14	265:21 268:10	modified 195:8	moving 52:2 70:23
44:20,22 45:6 50:3	206:13 209:4	161:6 163:1	270:24 271:4	modify 147:10	87:6 116:13,21
51:25 55:19 62:13	MEGAN 2:13	metres 5:23 46:20	minds 196:5 209:4	modulation 171:10	148:20
75:1,16 76:19 85:10	megawatt 53:6	47:3,19 48:12,19	217:1 222:8 257:7	194:6	much 1:23 6:2 10:8
85:12,14 88:22	megawatts 50:21	50:10,11,14,24 51:3	257:21	modus 37:10	12:7,18,23 17:22
92:14 94:5,15 97:17	52:23 53:5	51:16,16 58:18,19	mine 200:18	moment 7:5 14:16	18:18,20 25:16
97:18 99:24 100:18	MEHAR 2:4	59:22,22 73:4 78:4	Minear 1:11 19:1,7	46:4 72:1 86:6	31:19 43:3 49:24
100:20 101:10,15	melt 5:7	78:6,12,16,20,21,23	30:21,22 31:10,24	90:19 92:10 98:8	56:6 60:12 65:2
101:25 108:15,24	meltwater 5:20	81:19,21,23 82:12	32:7 36:10,12 37:18	115:18 141:1	72:17 77:1,24 87:3
108:25 109:4	members 2:2 26:25	82:14,15 86:3,17	38:16 43:23 44:24	149:12 155:9	
125:14 133:13		02.11,15 00.5,17			99.13.21.106.15
	116.8 18 137.2	87.2 18 88.9 89.6	44.25 45.8 23 46.5		99:13,21 106:15 115:22 126:7
136.19 146.5	116:8,18 137:2 143:6 166:5 168:19	87:2,18 88:9 89:6 94:14 101:14	44:25 45:8,23 46:5 46:7 47:22 48:4 8	197:15 215:3,22	115:22 126:7
136:19 146:5	143:6 166:5 168:19	94:14 101:14	46:7 47:22 48:4,8	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18
161:23 167:24	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorandum 155:24	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorandum 155:24 memorial 14:15 17:17	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorandum 155:24 memorial 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorandum 155:24 memorial 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3 46:11 47:10,18 59:9	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22	$\begin{array}{c} 115:22\ 126:7\\ 140:11\ 141:18\\ 142:8,25\ 157:4\\ 165:19\ 167:19\\ 168:6\ 169:12\ 173:9\\ 173:17\ 179:17\\ 190:16\ 192:22\\ 193:6,18\ 194:3,5,13\\ 195:10\ 200:23\\ 209:23\ 216:2\\ 218:13,13,13\ 219:6\\ 221:7\ 229:16\ 233:6\\ 253:13\ 256:14 \end{array}$
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorial 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3 46:11 47:10,18 59:9 73:15 81:15 84:23	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8	$\begin{array}{c} 115:22\ 126:7\\ 140:11\ 141:18\\ 142:8,25\ 157:4\\ 165:19\ 167:19\\ 168:6\ 169:12\ 173:9\\ 173:17\ 179:17\\ 190:16\ 192:22\\ 193:6,18\ 194:3,5,13\\ 195:10\ 200:23\\ 209:23\ 216:2\\ 218:13,13,13\ 219:6\\ 221:7\ 229:16\ 233:6\\ 253:13\ 256:14\\ 265:12,14\ 269:11\\ \end{array}$
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorial 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3 46:11 47:10,18 59:9 73:15 81:15 84:23 85:24 86:1 88:25	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18	$\begin{array}{c} 115:22\ 126:7\\ 140:11\ 141:18\\ 142:8,25\ 157:4\\ 165:19\ 167:19\\ 168:6\ 169:12\ 173:9\\ 173:17\ 179:17\\ 190:16\ 192:22\\ 193:6,18\ 194:3,5,13\\ 195:10\ 200:23\\ 209:23\ 216:2\\ 218:13,13,13\ 219:6\\ 221:7\ 229:16\ 233:6\\ 253:13\ 256:14\\ 265:12,14\ 269:11\\ 272:4,6,10\\ \end{array}$
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorial 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3 46:11 47:10,18 59:9 73:15 81:15 84:23 85:24 86:1 88:25 90:7 91:3 103:10	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimalist 187:12	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorandum 155:24 memorial 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3 46:11 47:10,18 59:9 73:15 81:15 84:23 85:24 86:1 88:25 90:7 91:3 103:10 116:9,14 168:24	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimals 187:12 minimise 3:21 155:13	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15 monthly 76:25	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multiple 6:7 35:10
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3 meanings 262:18	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorandum 155:24 memorial 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3 46:11 47:10,18 59:9 73:15 81:15 84:23 85:24 86:1 88:25 90:7 91:3 103:10 116:9,14 168:24 175:3 186:8 197:1	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimalst 187:12 minimise 3:21 155:13 155:16 174:18	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15 monthly 76:25 months 49:25 225:10	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multiple 6:7 35:10 69:19,24
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3 meanings 262:18 means 13:15 14:3 28:1	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorandum 155:24 memorial 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3 46:11 47:10,18 59:9 73:15 81:15 84:23 85:24 86:1 88:25 90:7 91:3 103:10 116:9,14 168:24 175:3 186:8 197:1 201:3 207:16 208:2	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8 might 25:23 35:8	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimal 112:17 minimalst 187:12 minimise 3:21 155:13 155:16 174:18 minimises 27:8	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15 monthly 76:25 months 49:25 225:10 245:1,2,2	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multiple 6:7 35:10 69:19,24 multiple 35:9 50:11
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3 meanings 262:18 means 13:15 14:3 28:1 34:25 35:3 43:19	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorandum 155:24 memoral 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3 46:11 47:10,18 59:9 73:15 81:15 84:23 85:24 86:1 88:25 90:7 91:3 103:10 116:9,14 168:24 175:3 186:8 197:1 201:3 207:16 208:2 233:22 236:9 238:7	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8 might 25:23 35:8 37:18 41:16 42:17	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimalist 187:12 minimalst 187:12 minimaist 187:13 155:16 174:18 minimises 27:8 minimising 148:24	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15 monthly 76:25 months 49:25 225:10 245:1,2,2 month's 35:19	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multiple 6:7 35:10 69:19,24 multiplied 35:9 50:11 50:12,13,15 146:6
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3 meanings 262:18 means 13:15 14:3 28:1 34:25 35:3 43:19 44:19 45:21 49:14	$\begin{array}{c} 143:6\ 166:5\ 168:19\\ 173:16\ 174:23\\ 175:7\ 176:1\ 178:9\\ 180:6\ 183:3\ 185:3\\ 189:18\ 196:2\ 201:5\\ 206:22\ 210:4,7\\ 229:1\ 230:14\ 231:2\\ 237:9,21\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 155:24\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 10:16:9,14\ 168:24\\ 175:3\ 186:8\ 197:1\\ 201:3\ 207:16\ 208:2\\ 233:22\ 236:9\ 238:7\\ 241:4,21\ 242:10,19\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 155:24:14.21\ 242:10,19\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 155:24\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 165:24\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 155:24\\ $	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimalist 187:12 minimalst 187:12 minimaist 187:13 155:16 174:18 minimises 27:8 minimising 148:24 minimum 6:18 16:15	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15 monthly 76:25 months 49:25 225:10 245:1,2,2 month's 35:19 moreover 21:14	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multiple 6:7 35:10 69:19,24 multipled 35:9 50:11 50:12,13,15 146:6 multiply 155:8
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3 meanings 262:18 means 13:15 14:3 28:1 34:25 35:3 43:19 44:19 45:21 49:14 71:21 75:17,22 77:7	$\begin{array}{c} 143:6\ 166:5\ 168:19\\ 173:16\ 174:23\\ 175:7\ 176:1\ 178:9\\ 180:6\ 183:3\ 185:3\\ 189:18\ 196:2\ 201:5\\ 206:22\ 210:4,7\\ 229:1\ 230:14\ 231:2\\ 237:9,21\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 155:24\\ \textbf{memoral}\ 14:15\ 17:17\\ 21:11\ 22:12\ 36:3\\ 46:11\ 47:10,18\ 59:9\\ 73:15\ 81:15\ 84:23\\ 85:24\ 86:1\ 88:25\\ 90:7\ 91:3\ 103:10\\ 116:9,14\ 168:24\\ 175:3\ 186:8\ 197:1\\ 201:3\ 207:16\ 208:2\\ 233:22\ 236:9\ 238:7\\ 241:4,21\ 242:10,19\\ 244:1\ 245:14\ 246:5\end{array}$	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8 might 25:23 35:8 37:18 41:16 42:17 44:16 54:4 59:7 70:4 76:5,6 84:24	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimalist 187:12 minimaist 187:12 minimaise 3:21 155:13 155:16 174:18 minimises 27:8 minimising 148:24 minimum 6:18 16:15 24:2 44:20,22 45:6	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15 monthly 76:25 months 49:25 225:10 245:1,2,2 month's 35:19 moreover 21:14 123:25 129:4	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multipled 35:9 50:11 50:12,13,15 146:6 multiply 155:8 MURPHY 1:10
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3 meanings 262:18 means 13:15 14:3 28:1 34:25 35:3 43:19 44:19 45:21 49:14 71:21 75:17,22 77:7 82:8 87:1 88:17,19	$\begin{array}{c} 143:6\ 166:5\ 168:19\\ 173:16\ 174:23\\ 175:7\ 176:1\ 178:9\\ 180:6\ 183:3\ 185:3\\ 189:18\ 196:2\ 201:5\\ 206:22\ 210:4,7\\ 229:1\ 230:14\ 231:2\\ 237:9,21\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 155:24\\ $	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8 middle 11:5 47:6 49:8	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimalist 187:12 minimise 3:21 155:13 155:16 174:18 minimises 27:8 minimising 148:24 minimising 148:24 minimising 148:24 minimising 148:24 51:25 55:19 56:10	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15 monthy 76:25 months 49:25 225:10 245:1,2,2 month's 35:19 moreover 21:14 123:25 129:4 176:16 188:20	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multiple 6:7 35:10 69:19,24 multiple 35:9 50:11 50:12,13,15 146:6 multiply 155:8 MURPHY 1:10 Murphy's 142:19
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3 meanings 262:18 means 13:15 14:3 28:1 34:25 35:3 43:19 44:19 45:21 49:14 71:21 75:17,22 77:7 82:8 87:1 88:17,19 88:20 95:5,14,16	$\begin{array}{c} 143:6\ 166:5\ 168:19\\ 173:16\ 174:23\\ 175:7\ 176:1\ 178:9\\ 180:6\ 183:3\ 185:3\\ 189:18\ 196:2\ 201:5\\ 206:22\ 210:4,7\\ 229:1\ 230:14\ 231:2\\ 237:9,21\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 155:24\\ \textbf{memoral}\ 14:15\ 17:17\\ 21:11\ 22:12\ 36:3\\ 46:11\ 47:10,18\ 59:9\\ 73:15\ 81:15\ 84:23\\ 85:24\ 86:1\ 88:25\\ 90:7\ 91:3\ 103:10\\ 116:9,14\ 168:24\\ 175:3\ 186:8\ 197:1\\ 201:3\ 207:16\ 208:2\\ 233:22\ 236:9\ 238:7\\ 241:4,21\ 242:10,19\\ 244:1\ 245:14\ 246:5\\ 246:21\ 247:2,24\\ 248:9\ 257:11\ 258:6\\ \end{array}$	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8 midle 11:5 47:6 49:8 might 25:23 35:8 37:18 41:16 42:17 44:16 54:4 59:7 70:4 76:5,6 84:24 91:7 93:4 94:19 95:24 101:11,21	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimalist 187:12 minimise 3:21 155:13 155:16 174:18 minimise 27:8 minimise 27:8 minimise 148:24 minimum 6:18 16:15 24:2 44:20,22 45:6 51:25 55:19 56:10 94:15 101:10,15	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15 monthy 76:25 months 49:25 225:10 245:1,2,2 month's 35:19 moreover 21:14 123:25 129:4 176:16 188:20 morning 1:14 9:18	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multiple 6:7 35:10 69:19,24 multiple 4:7 35:9 50:11 50:12,13,15 146:6 multiply 155:8 MURPHY 1:10 Murphy's 142:19 must 6:5 9:14 14:11
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3 meanings 262:18 means 13:15 14:3 28:1 34:25 35:3 43:19 44:19 45:21 49:14 71:21 75:17,22 77:7 82:8 87:1 88:17,19 88:20 95:5,14,16 106:1,10,12 108:21	143:6 166:5 168:19 173:16 174:23 175:7 176:1 178:9 180:6 183:3 185:3 189:18 196:2 201:5 206:22 210:4,7 229:1 230:14 231:2 237:9,21 memorandum 155:24 memorial 14:15 17:17 21:11 22:12 36:3 46:11 47:10,18 59:9 73:15 81:15 84:23 85:24 86:1 88:25 90:7 91:3 103:10 116:9,14 168:24 175:3 186:8 197:1 201:3 207:16 208:2 233:22 236:9 238:7 241:4,21 242:10,19 244:1 245:14 246:5 246:21 247:2,24 248:9 257:11 258:6 memory 196:25	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8 midle 11:5 47:6 49:8 might 25:23 35:8 37:18 41:16 42:17 44:16 54:4 59:7 70:4 76:5,6 84:24 91:7 93:4 94:19 95:24 101:11,21 109:10 113:21	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimals 187:12 minimise 3:21 155:13 155:16 174:18 minimise 27:8 minimise 148:24 minimise 148:24 minimise 18 16:15 24:2 44:20,22 45:6 51:25 55:19 56:10 94:15 101:10,15 108:14,24,25 109:4	$\begin{array}{c} 197:15\ 215:3,22\\ 218:15\ 222:22\\ 236:7\ 241:6\ 243:14\\ 252:9\ 254:4\ 256:1\\ 266:15,19\ 267:6,9\\ \textbf{moments}\ 190:1\\ \textbf{Monday}\ 9:20\ 10:3\\ 96:4\ 107:10\ 171:25\\ 225:1\ 253:9,9\ 259:2\\ 266:5,9,9,23,24,24\\ \textbf{Monday/Tuesday}\\ 271:16\\ \textbf{monsoon}\ 5:20\ 6:22\\ 230:8\\ \textbf{month}\ 114:6,18\\ 130:15\\ \textbf{monthly}\ 76:25\\ \textbf{months}\ 49:25\ 225:10\\ 245:1,2,2\\ \textbf{month's}\ 35:19\\ \textbf{moreover}\ 21:14\\ 123:25\ 129:4\\ 176:16\ 188:20\\ \textbf{morning}\ 1:14\ 9:18\\ 142:8\ 153:2\ 259:19\\ \end{array}$	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multiple 6:7 35:10 69:19,24 multipled 35:9 50:11 50:12,13,15 146:6 multiply 155:8 MURPHY 1:10 Murphy's 142:19 must 6:5 9:14 14:11 27:15 36:7 40:3,21
161:23 167:24 214:25 226:6 254:25 256:9 265:12 meandering 74:18 meaning 44:9,10 45:13 56:18 62:21 87:11 115:5 124:17 169:16 173:14 179:6 232:18,19 242:14 265:2 meaningful 11:10 13:16 95:7 102:20 104:25 105:24 112:3 meanings 262:18 means 13:15 14:3 28:1 34:25 35:3 43:19 44:19 45:21 49:14 71:21 75:17,22 77:7 82:8 87:1 88:17,19 88:20 95:5,14,16	$\begin{array}{c} 143:6\ 166:5\ 168:19\\ 173:16\ 174:23\\ 175:7\ 176:1\ 178:9\\ 180:6\ 183:3\ 185:3\\ 189:18\ 196:2\ 201:5\\ 206:22\ 210:4,7\\ 229:1\ 230:14\ 231:2\\ 237:9,21\\ \textbf{memorandum}\ 155:24\\ \textbf{memoral}\ 14:15\ 17:17\\ 21:11\ 22:12\ 36:3\\ 46:11\ 47:10,18\ 59:9\\ 73:15\ 81:15\ 84:23\\ 85:24\ 86:1\ 88:25\\ 90:7\ 91:3\ 103:10\\ 116:9,14\ 168:24\\ 175:3\ 186:8\ 197:1\\ 201:3\ 207:16\ 208:2\\ 233:22\ 236:9\ 238:7\\ 241:4,21\ 242:10,19\\ 244:1\ 245:14\ 246:5\\ 246:21\ 247:2,24\\ 248:9\ 257:11\ 258:6\\ \end{array}$	94:14 101:14 105:12,14 106:11 106:18 125:2,5 131:6,7,15,16 132:3 132:5 133:4 147:19 147:21,23 148:6,13 148:15 149:12,13 153:9,15,25 154:1,4 154:11,12,21 155:2 155:4,6,22 161:5,24 162:1,5,8 163:7,8,9 163:11,13,14 metres-per-second 78:9 Miana 150:4 159:14 microphone 267:8 midle 11:5 47:6 49:8 might 25:23 35:8 37:18 41:16 42:17 44:16 54:4 59:7 70:4 76:5,6 84:24 91:7 93:4 94:19 95:24 101:11,21	46:7 47:22 48:4,8 53:7,8,13,15 57:12 57:13,19 62:9,15 64:10,17,25 71:1,3 71:12 84:22,23 85:10,13,19,22,24 88:25 91:5 96:14,15 96:22 97:12,24 98:9 101:3,4 102:4 107:23 108:3,7 218:1 226:14 232:11 264:19,20 Minear's 56:22 71:2 minimal 112:17 minimalist 187:12 minimise 3:21 155:13 155:16 174:18 minimise 27:8 minimise 27:8 minimise 148:24 minimum 6:18 16:15 24:2 44:20,22 45:6 51:25 55:19 56:10 94:15 101:10,15	197:15 215:3,22 218:15 222:22 236:7 241:6 243:14 252:9 254:4 256:1 266:15,19 267:6,9 moments 190:1 Monday 9:20 10:3 96:4 107:10 171:25 225:1 253:9,9 259:2 266:5,9,9,23,24,24 Monday/Tuesday 271:16 monsoon 5:20 6:22 230:8 month 114:6,18 130:15 monthy 76:25 months 49:25 225:10 245:1,2,2 month's 35:19 moreover 21:14 123:25 129:4 176:16 188:20 morning 1:14 9:18	115:22 126:7 140:11 141:18 142:8,25 157:4 165:19 167:19 168:6 169:12 173:9 173:17 179:17 190:16 192:22 193:6,18 194:3,5,13 195:10 200:23 209:23 216:2 218:13,13,13 219:6 221:7 229:16 233:6 253:13 256:14 265:12,14 269:11 272:4,6,10 MUHAMMAD 2:4 multiple 6:7 35:10 69:19,24 multiple 4:7 35:9 50:11 50:12,13,15 146:6 multiply 155:8 MURPHY 1:10 Murphy's 142:19 must 6:5 9:14 14:11

					[]
61:16 63:1 66:18	67:19 75:16 87:15	258:18	149:12 190:8	182:5 184:16 185:8	195:24 256:2,23
68:9 69:25 77:14	116:14 139:23	negotiations 22:14,17	196:12,19 197:14	187:10 195:6 212:6	271:13
107:21 121:15	186:24 248:18	22:20 187:10 209:5	232:18 233:11	214:18 217:24	old 144:1
123:18 135:6 138:3	252:3 257:18	216:19	258:24	220:9,24 227:6	omissions 135:4
141:3 146:15,22	259:25	negotiator 217:9	normally 70:4 195:12	243:8 248:24	once 11:4 14:9 32:17
,		negotiators 217:1	197:20		41:11 50:6 68:14
150:14,14 156:6	necessary 5:15 42:6			249:11	
183:18 203:16	75:2 76:20 81:14	neither 99:6	norms 131:12	obliged 186:13	76:14 81:23 101:5
206:2 219:14 222:6	87:7 103:8 120:8	Nemer 177:12	North 200:8	observation 204:12	101:20 106:24
223:16,18 229:6	150:12,14 156:20	Netherlands 1:5 2:7,8	Northern 126:15	208:13 262:11	107:23 111:7 130:2
230:5 233:10 249:2	159:21 169:15	2:9	130:10 178:4 184:4	observations 4:8,12	131:2 153:7 156:25
249:10	185:1 188:3 203:13	neutral 117:4,10,25	184:18	196:3,4,8 201:11	160:8 177:24
MUSTANSAR 2:6	205:16 209:16	118:9 126:12 172:9	Norway 185:19,23	206:21 207:5,17	182:19 183:16
mutual 240:7,15	215:4 219:19 244:9	193:5 203:5,21	Norwegian 186:16	208:1 210:17	228:21 233:9
mutually 172:8	244:16 249:24	204:21 205:8,10,14	notably 69:6 243:16	observed 34:4 118:8	238:16 251:22
MW 6:20 7:8,13 12:19	250:5,9 251:18	209:20,21 235:13	note 22:15 73:14 85:1	183:22 185:15	256:15 258:10
12:24 16:23 17:6,7	253:6 260:23	235:13,21 236:2	116:8 252:2 253:5	187:11 188:11,23	267:14
17:9,10 51:1,6	need 1:6 13:23 14:1	238:5,7,9 239:22,24	noted 21:10 33:11	observer 118:8	ones 120:1 265:22,25
106:11,15 125:1,4	18:12 19:11 23:19	241:24,25 243:21	67:6 80:16 186:14	observes 126:12	265:25
131:19,19 162:2,4	38:17 43:14 61:5	248:12,15 251:7	188:18 236:11	obsolete 137:21	one-day 64:14,20
167:23 229:8,9	65:21 68:3 73:17	252:13 261:6	notes 103:13 128:22	obstruction 65:15	one-sided 215:6
232:25	74:13 79:19,24	never 68:6 75:17	nothing 54:25 55:25	214:1,8	one-size-fits-all 18:23
myself 68:12 178:13	82:13,16 84:6 86:14	94:20,23,24 128:17	97:11 180:7	obtained 50:20 111:8	one-time 70:12
225:1 227:5		nevertheless 105:18	notified 105:7	obtaining 182:18	ongoing 41:7 217:4
	88:17,19 91:12 97:5			8	ongoing 41:7 217:4 online 11:2
m3/s 125:10,15	99:22 100:6 109:3,4	117:17 152:9	notify 47:15 226:10	obvious 52:5 70:14	
	113:9 115:24	new 1:14 2:18 3:4	notifying 61:19	135:24	only 5:19 9:10 16:15
<u> </u>	116:16 123:12	23:25 47:15 52:12	noting 67:1 195:12	obviously 7:12 10:5	17:4 19:15 23:20
name 4:16 15:17	136:14 144:11	61:6,20 148:12	265:18	15:24 23:17 31:16	25:3 29:19 30:13
namely 184:1	146:1 147:1 148:22	155:12 163:11	notwithstanding	36:15 53:20 55:6	42:20 46:6,9 49:15
names 199:23	152:22 154:24	164:3 181:18	88:23 224:6	60:3 75:22 90:13	49:22 51:9,12,13,20
napkin 28:13 56:6	155:11 158:5,11,13	187:15 265:24	nowhere 123:11	93:20 95:3,13 103:9	54:11 73:11 74:8
narrative 4:5 168:18	164:1 168:9 174:2	269:21	128:12	103:24 113:17	77:3 80:15,17,18,22
168:24 170:1	177:8 183:7 184:2,7	next 9:15 54:4 130:9	nuanced 218:13	115:5,18 132:24	82:16,24 83:5,8
175:11,21 176:4	185:4,13 186:5	134:3 149:25 156:2	nub 43:5	135:4 159:15 161:4	88:3,8 89:22 92:9
179:13 183:4 184:3	191:22 202:5 204:8	171:12 174:14	nuclear 30:8 187:11	167:4,8 202:20	92:22 94:1 95:19
188:3 189:14	213:19,20 216:3,22	193:23 195:11	number 15:23 51:9	203:9 206:3 226:1	103:22 106:17,23
190:15,25 191:7	216:22 217:17,19	199:4 206:7 210:24	56:24 81:8 82:2	231:9 234:10 235:7	107:17 110:1,5
196:15 197:7	217:20 231:1 233:2	220:3 229:2 232:8	101:5,13 105:17	236:12,20 241:10	115:11 119:9 121:1
198:19 244:7 247:6	236:17 237:22	232:20 233:23	127:17 130:24	246:21 254:23	121:13 122:4,14
247:15	238:22 240:13,22	241:7 245:10,25	133:17 141:12	266:17 269:8	123:16 125:15
	242:8 243:1 244:18	248:21 272:5	167:21 191:6,6	270:10	130:2 135:19 141:5
narrow 21:15,17	245:17 246:23	Nicaragua 169:14	196:23 197:16,17	occasion 139:10	146:1 149:14
150:16 173:11	250:21 251:8,12	170:19	202:10,13 207:17	226:24	150:11 152:10
179:7	253:6 255:6 259:3	Nigeria 171:5	220:7 223:13,25	occasionally 97:20	158:8 159:19 162:4
narrower 200:12	261:18 267:11	night 1:8 9:19 10:10	234:20,23 240:2	occupying 13:16 29:8	162:7,22 174:7
209:23		0	-	occur 74:8 94:19	183:19 185:16
narrowly 22:6 217:20	268:8,11 269:16 271:20	63:24 64:5 251:22	258:2 265:7		
217:25 219:14		nine 70:25 71:25	numbers 102:23 104:9	108:11,19 109:8	187:7 189:6 199:18
NASIR 2:8	needed 121:25 153:2	Nirvana 254:25	104:12	158:5 172:12	201:16 204:11
national 223:21	156:12 179:17	NJHEP 5:19,23 7:14	numerous 69:5	occurring 49:8	208:22 209:8
natural 6:15 7:23 8:5	236:19	106:13 131:22,23	nutshell 147:9	occurs 107:15	215:20 218:23
73:3,18 74:16 78:22	needing 87:4	144:3,8 148:7 149:4		October 169:9	219:18 223:20
79:21 83:3,7 205:12	needs 52:3 69:1 78:12	149:12,15 152:8,19	0	off 37:13 68:19 71:15	224:1 228:19
naturally 129:10	82:9 160:9 218:10	156:3 158:19 162:7	object 70:1 187:15	91:15 118:4 122:11	230:20,25 233:25
nature 16:5 147:4	226:17 233:22	162:10,14 163:3	219:25	132:12 196:18	234:1 240:9,10
173:3 176:15 177:4	238:14 242:23	164:16,23	objection 41:18	204:13,21 218:16	246:12 250:14
177:22 180:17	Neelum 5:3 229:10	NJHEP's 154:14	objections 174:20	221:18 222:18	252:9 253:5 259:17
190:8 226:13 234:4	Neelum-Jhelum 5:4	157:6	objective 41:20,22	237:24,25 241:8	263:18
243:3 247:19,23	15:10,14,18,19	none 56:18 235:14	58:5 121:9 184:24	251:22 265:18	onwards 22:14
255:23 271:5	131:20 144:2,7	nonetheless 206:23	objectives 23:9 128:22	Office 2:6	open 27:3 69:24 195:4
nauseam 219:12	145:11,17 147:11	210:25	136:9 179:14	officio 251:21	217:17 232:24
navigation 211:13	147:13,16 148:5	nonsensical 226:7	object(s) 129:5	off-course 61:10 207:1	270:3
ne 129:4 176:25	150:5,11,21 151:3	non-interference	obligated 254:4	often 108:15,18	opened 101:4
183:20,20 185:24	158:23,24 161:2,23	213:8,9 214:7,16	obligation 21:3,6 41:8	Oh 17:8 36:11	opening 1:6,8 42:14
near 6:17 12:12,14	163:17,21 166:13	non-paragraph	188:16 195:3	okay 17:11,15 32:7	191:13 222:17
49:8	neglects 134:14	240:21	211:20,22 212:2,3,3	39:4 54:2 57:19	234:18 239:16
nearly 118:4	negotiate 37:15	non-power 26:15	211:20,22 212:2,3,3	71:15 94:11 95:20	opens 193:1,8
	negotiating 24:14,18	non-Treaty 34:3	255:21	96:13 98:9 108:7	operate 8:22 10:21,24
neatly 72:20 necessarily 21:13	37:12	noon 142:5 265:20	obligations 175:1	115:3,8 134:5,9	82:3 92:22 107:1,16
31:17 52:5 60:22	negotiation 37:20	normal 34:14 140:18	179:5 180:1 181:14	142:11,18 168:9	125:16 128:3
51.17 52.5 00:22			177.3 100.1 101:14		

154:22 157:15 158:16 255:12 55:24 56:11,17:24 pattern 250:18:20 251:11 250:18:20 251:18:18:18:20 252:16:18:18:20 251:18:18:18:20 252:16:18:18:18:20 252:16:18:18:18:20 252:16:18:18:18:20 252:16:18:18:18:20 252:16:18:18:18:1						1
2164 239:19 operated 00:16 Contlancy 14:13 17:18 0 vertopping 154:9 operated 26:16 2249 242 25:19 0 vertopping 154:9 overtopping 155:0 overtopping 154:0 overtopping 155:0 overtopping 155:0	143:19 205:10.11	121:25	122:20 126:9	oversight 16:24	242:4.7 244:16.20	150:13 152:5
operated 00:16 81:9 1720 33:16 45:13 142:01 144:80 15:38 overtoppint 15:49 26:61:2 partial 23:85:89 15:12:12:15:15 operates 216:6.6 organisation 24:01:1 15:72:01 099 165:4 overtoppint 15:49 26:61:2 overtoppint 15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:1	,					
942.4 46:16:8:23:26:2 1482:01:58:8 overrighting 154:9 26:6:24:28:84 81:5:12:41:21:73 26:12 organise 201:23 169:17:73:10 overrighting 154:9 overrighting 154:9 overrighting 134:58:9 frield 233:58:9 frield 233:58:58:55:58:59:59:58:58:59:59:59:58:58:59:59:59:59:58:58:5		v				
operate 2164.6 operation 524 013 organisation 240:11 157.20 1009 1054 (55.9 own 19 55 (56.2) spartial 238 559 164:18 2011 364 130:18 240.20 266.3 188:2 1953 198:14 127:11 81:14 156.3 17:21 178.14 156.3 17:21 178.14 156.3 17:21 178.14 100.40 38.14 2011 364 137.14 240.18 216.16 22.15 227.20.25 228.14 222.25 128.15 100.24 66.16 3014 665 70:11 240.18 216.16 22.01 220.12 36.02 422.12 66.11 100.24 66.16 3142 157.15 188.25 199.31.02 217.13 32.01.2 201.31 368.15 31.17 50.91.05.11 255.24 56.1 59.11 256.02 35.11 45.02 31.17 50.91.05.11 256.02 35.11 45.02 31.17 50.91.05.11 256.02 35.11 45.02 31.17 50.91.05.11 256.02 35.11 45.02 31.17 50.91.05.11 256.02 31.17 50.91.05.11 256.02 31.17 50.91.05.11 256.02 31.17 50.91.05.11 256.02 31.11 45.02 31.17 50.91.05.11 31.01 450.02 31.01 450.02 31.01 450.02 31.01 450.02 31.01 450.02 31.01 450.02 31.01 450.02 31.01 450.02 31.01 450.02 31.0						
264:12 organise 20123 169:17 173:10 organise 20123 169:27 173:10 Sci 195:25 195:5 Sci 172:21 173:9 passage 10:90:22.4 20:11 36:14 39:11 organised 64:25 198:16,42 210:22 189:25 199:5 200:321 245:8 passage 30:80:23.4 30:14 65:70 oriented 27:3.6 231:19 23:21 228:15 248:2 passage 30:80:23.4 passag						
operation 5:24 10:18 240:20 2663 188: 1953 198:14 127:1181:14 1563 172:1739 passage-bit 02:1 30:11 364 385 70:11 240:18 216:16 22:15 227:20.25 228:14 252:25 227:20.25 228:14 252:25 227:20.25 228:14 252:25 227:20.25 228:14 110:24 363:16 10:92 128:92.3 orifice 147:3 1492.1 240:8 24:18 240:8 24:18 261:13 268:25 42:21 26:15:11 passing-back 20:26 31:31 22:24 10:81:10:10:0 0rigin 29:2 20:13 26:24:24:15:16 passing-back 20:26 26:13 26:24:26:25:16:11 passing-back 20:26 26:13 26:24:26:26:16:11 passing-back 20:26:16:17:17:16:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:		5			-	
20:11 36:14 39:11 organised (4:25 198:16/24 210:22 189:25 1995 200.32 1285 passed 40:38:14 90:16 02:51 128,923 orfinet 1257:36 231:19 233:21 228:15 2482 particular 47:18:10 passed 30:38:14 10:25 128,923 orfinet 1257:36 231:19 233:21 228:15 2482 particular 47:18:10 passed 30:38:14 13:22 127:15 158:25 199-3.10.20 orticat 47:31 49:21 orticat 47:31 49:21 20:18:25 31:17 55:0.10:51:12 passing 24:61 20:18:20 20:23:24 24:10 160:18 164:10.61 orticat 48:15:6 orticat 48:15:6 71:17:16:76:27:33 75:24 56:10:51:22 20:18:20 20:23:24 24:10:10 16:16:16:13:10:20 orticat 14:50:24 16:10:16:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:		5		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
39:14 66:5 70:11 240:18 216:16 222:15 22720.25 228:14 252.25 110:24 63:16 109:25 128:9.23 orifice 147.31 49:21 240:8 24:218 20:13 268:25 42:12 16:15:11 passing 24:66:18 131:19 23:12 158:25 159:31.00.0 251:12 25:33 142:12 19:520 541:11.31,724 250:18.20 253:12 23:10	-					
99:02:010623 oriented 257:36 231:9 23:21 228:15 248:2 particular 471:180:9 passes 78:10 109:25 128:92.3 riffse: 1473:149:21 21:05:32 21:02:53 21:02:53 21:02:53 21:12:55 31:17:30:01:01:12 33:17:30:01:01:12 33:17:30:01:01:12 33:17:30:01:01:12 33:17:30:01:01:12 33:17:30:01:01:16:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:		5	-			-
109.25 128-9.23 orifice 147:3 19:21 240.82 242:18 261:13 208:25 4.22:16 15:11 passing-back 2068 134:219 146:11 155:15 15:40:10 56:1 246:24 2475;13 0'clock 15:55 14:01 56:1 passing-back 2068 138:19 227:24 100:18 16:40:10 original 10:97 14:81:16 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 127:13 21:01:2 220:12:0:01:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14 127:14 13:2:0:14				-		
142:19146:17 151:15154:1056:1 246:24 247:51.3 9*cinck 115:25 140:13 31:17 200:1051:12 past 145:20 248:7 131:19 227:24 160:18 16:10.16 outcome 24:16 60:20 267:3 5524 56:15-12.2 past 145:20 248:7 233:11 234:16 165:11.22 172:13 21:02		· · · · ·			-	•
154:22 157:5 158:25 159:10 251:12 142:12 552:05 552:45 91:11 755:76:22:73:37 91:11 755:76:22:75 91:11	109:25 128:9,23	orifice 147:3 149:21	240:8 242:18	261:13 268:25	4:22 12:6 15:11	passing 246:18
181:19 227:24 1061:18 164:10,16 outcome 24:16 60:20 257:3 552:45 (5:19:12) patiene 1737:443; 233:11 234:14.16 1051:12.22 outles 14:71.05 T2:13 210:12 T patiene 1737:443; patiene 1737:443; 233:24 234:14 417.16 154:22.28:8 34:12 144:20 145:1 page 91:51 225 (10:06) 92:15 20:93 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06) 92:15 20:91 (10:06)	142:19 146:17	151:5 154:10 156:1	246:24 247:5,13	o'clock 115:25 140:18	31:17 50:9,10 51:12	passing-back 205:8
233:11 234:16 165:11,22 172:13 210:12 P netime: 137:4 233 patience 137:4 137:4 patience 137:4 137:4 262:24 264:17.16 original 109:7 148:16 0 P 11:11 55.7622.77:35 patiente 137:2.0 33:24 34:144:17.16 154:22 228:8 146:24 156:13 26:57 13:13 14:67.18 patiente 137:4.13 93:14 106:11 45:9 49:14 06:9 20:12 22:14 pages 10:31:22 36:15 139:10 172:16 pas:24 13:71:41 pas:24 13:71	154:22 157:15	158:25 159:3,10,20	251:1 255:3	142:12 195:20	54:11,13,17,24	past 145:20 248:7
2262.24 264:16 origin 239:2 onttes 147:20:6 P 75:70:27:25 puttent 137:2 33:34 34:14 417.16 154:2 228.8 34:12 144/20.145:1 pgg 91:5 125:6 16%. 51:17 86:5 89:10:82.2 20:31.2 12:61 6 93:14 100:21 107:3 34:11 40:4 41:17 160:16 165:13 26:57 114:18 1127.6 99:15 12:36 16%. 99:15 12:36 16%. 99:15 12:36 16%. 99:15 12:36 16%. 99:15 12:32 16:16 99:15 12:32 16:16 99:15 12:32 16:16 99:14 40:29 17:14 13:14 148 99:15 12:12 16:16 99:14 13:14 144:17:14 138 99:16 12:17:14 13:12 16:11:12 99:16 12:12:14 13:12 16:11:12 99:15 13:12 10:11:12 151:12 10:15:12 100:15:12 10:11:12:16 11:12:44 229:22 36:32:22:44 92:11:13 22:06:14 99:16:23 16:25:14 99:16:15:11:14:14 226:22 26:10 226:12 27:14 99:16:15:11:14:14 129:11 139:10 100:12:5 129:11 139:10 100:12:5 129:11 139:10 100:12:5 129:11 139:10 100:12:16:12:44 229:12 26:16 99:11:16:12:17:17:14:13:12:15 120:11:13:12:16:11:12:15:11 129:11 139:10 100:12:10:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:11:12:	181:19 227:24	160:18 164:10,16	outcome 24:16 60:20	267:3	55:24 56:1 59:12	250:18,20
2262.24 264:16 origin 239:2 onttes 147:20:6 P 75:70:27:25 puttent 137:2 33:34 34:14 417.16 154:2 228.8 34:12 144/20.145:1 pgg 91:5 125:6 16%. 51:17 86:5 89:10:82.2 20:31.2 12:61 6 93:14 100:21 107:3 34:11 40:4 41:17 160:16 165:13 26:57 114:18 1127.6 99:15 12:36 16%. 99:15 12:36 16%. 99:15 12:36 16%. 99:15 12:36 16%. 99:15 12:32 16:16 99:15 12:32 16:16 99:15 12:32 16:16 99:14 40:29 17:14 13:14 148 99:15 12:12 16:16 99:14 13:14 144:17:14 138 99:16 12:17:14 13:12 16:11:12 99:16 12:12:14 13:12 16:11:12 99:15 13:12 10:11:12 151:12 10:15:12 100:15:12 10:11:12:16 11:12:44 229:22 36:32:22:44 92:11:13 22:06:14 99:16:23 16:25:14 99:16:15:11:14:14 226:22 26:10 226:12 27:14 99:16:15:11:14:14 129:11 139:10 100:12:5 129:11 139:10 100:12:5 129:11 139:10 100:12:5 129:11 139:10 100:12:16:12:44 229:12 26:16 99:11:16:12:17:17:14:13:12:15 120:11:13:12:16:11:12:15:11 129:11 139:10 100:12:10:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:12:10:11:11:12:	233:11 234:16	165:11,22	172:13 210:12		61:17 66:2 73:3	patience 137:4 143:9
operational 18:1,31.5 original 1097 148:16 ontes 147.20:6 p1:11 81:12 p1:13		-	outlet 34:18 151:6	Р		-
33:24 3:14 417,16 1542 228.8 34:12 144/20 145:1 page 19:5 1256 169.6 92:13:20 93:16.8 pattern 10:24,9 49 92:16 649 20:00 0ther 20:81,2 25:25 146:24 156:15 19 17:31 92:0:22 13:31 14:63.14 18:32 12:61 6 97:18 10:11 45:94:94:40 63:97:0:23 74:10.19 0utilier 61:61:13 26:57 14:81 127:6 19:91:13:91:0 00:0:41:37:14 13:14 124:4 129:18 2494 89:20 19:0:22 10:0:12:29:10:22 0utilier 61:81 13:2 244:2 23:92:22 19:21:11:98:4:07:8 20:64:92:36:32:24 19:21:11:32:16 12:64:23:6:0:24 24:6:19 12:91:13:91:0 00:0:4:57:4:17:14 12:91:13:12:0:12:16 12:81:12:12:13:12:12 12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:13:12:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:12:14:14:12:14:11:14:1		5				-
42: 66:4 92:19 other 208.12 23:25 146:24 156:15.19 173:19 129:22 113:13 11:46:7.18 82:21 126:16 93:14 106:11 45:9 49:14 06:04 126:12 3:10.15 63:9 70:24 73:10.19 024:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14 138:15 90:24:137:14:138:16 90:24:137:14:138:16 90:24:137:14:138:16 90:24:137:14:138:16 90:24:137:14:138:16 90:25:136:16:17 90:24:137:14:15 90:25:136:16:17 90:25:136:16:17 90:25:136:16:17 90:25:136:16:17 90:25:15:15:16 90:13:136:16:17 90:25:15:15:15 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:15:16:17 90:13:16:15:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:16:17 90:13:16:16:17 90:13:1	•	5				1 0
93:14 106:21 107:3 34:11 40:44:17 160:16 165:13 2657 112:16 112:16 12:17:10 pages 103:12 236:15 12:11 18:10 pock 13:17:10 112:46 128:10.15 63:9 70:24 74:10.19 outlier 104:22 24:12 12:11 18:10 15:23 18:15:10 operations 35:3 0:20 101:12,19 10:325 outlier 104:22 pakt smi1 24:5:2 11:12:16:11 24:62 28:20 20:4 26:23 26:32:22.4 12:11 18:4:10:17 24:6:12 operation 35:3 0:20 11:12:15 outset 81:12 11:23 11:5:2 outset 81:12 13:15:2 26:3:0:30:14 25:7:20:12:16:17 24:16:14 29:11 16:5:15 operation 31:6, 13:12, 16:15 13:12 20:14 23:16 24:9:12 parabolic 80:1 26:16:12:42:27:20 parabolic 80:1 26:17:42:17:23 24:12 13:12:15 17:42:17:17:3:10:12:16:17 26:17:42:17:23 24:12 13:12:15:16:16:12:13:24:17:12:15:16:16:12:13:12:16:17 26:12:42:27:12:16:17 26:12:42:27:12:16:17 26:12:42:27:12:16:17 26:12:42:27:12:16:17 26:12:42:27:12:16:17 26:12:42:17:12:16:17 26:12:42:17:12:12:16:17 26:12:12:16:17 26:12:12:16:17 26:12:12:16:17 26:12:12:16:17 26:12:12:16:17 26:12:12:17:17:10:11:11:12:15 27:11:11:11:						-
107.18 109:11 459.49:14 009 220:12 221:4 press 103:12 236:15 129:11 139:10 90:24 137:14 138 124 123:10.15 63:9 70:24 73:10.15 63:9 70:24 73:10.15 paid 252:9 paid 252:9 192:11 189:10 204:63 245:15 409 63:13.23 66:10 127:14 138:15 outliers 18:13:2 183:3 24:12 21:13 63:63 2479 passing 102:25 409 63:13.23 66:10 13:623 137:1 151:5 outside 11:23 113:24 pager 60:15 10:3:14 257:4 261:21.23 pages 73:89,11 26:22 26:10 pager 60:15 10:3:14 26:22 26:10 pager 60:15 10:3:14 26:22 26:10 pager 60:15 10:3:14 26:12 20:10 pager 60:15 10:3:14 26:12 20:10 pages 28:9,11 26:12 20:11 10:25 pager 60:15 10:3:14 26:12 20:11 10:25 pager 60:15 10:3:14 26:12 20:11 10:25 pager 60:15 10:3:14 26:12 20:11 10:25 12:11 12:11 12:11 22:13 22:14 Palae: 14:25 11:12:11 22:13 24:14 Palae: 14:25 11:12:11 22:13 22:14 Palae: 14:25 11:12:11 22:13 22:14 Palae: 14:25 11:12:11 22:13 22:14 Palae: 14:25 11:12:11 21:13:12:11:12:11 22:13 22:14:12:11:12:11 22:13 22:14:12:11:12:11:12:11 21:11:12:11:12:11 22:13 20:12:11 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
112.61 63.9 70.24 74.10.9 outlier 104-22 24.42 71.21.66 158.23 158.12						-
1244 129:18 249-4 89:21 96:24 99:18 outliers 61:8 113:2 pati 52:99 187:3 191:20 204:69 245:15 operationalise 18:55 101:21 91 03:25 outliers 61:8 113:21 122:3 26:22 192:11 198:4 207:8 224:16 224:16 224:16 223:13:12 16:15 patient 24:52.4 221:11 198:4 207:8 226:23 26:02 66:32 221:11 198:4 207:8 patient 26:23:6 27:9 patient 26:25:24:25:15:16 patien 26:23:6 27:9 patien 2						
operations 3:3 9:20 (10:5) 115:12 outline(183:3) (10:5) 115:12 paistan(2) 45:24 (11:21) 123:12:16:11 (12:3) 123:24 (11:22) 123:23 26:22,24 (12:12) 123:16:11 (12:23) 26:22,24 (12:12) 123:16:11 (12:12) 115:11:18 15:26:16 (11:22) 112:12 Paistan(2) 45:24 (12:23) 26:22,24 (12:12) 123:16:11 (12:23) 26:12 103:14 (11:22) 124:62 Paistan(2) 45:24 (12:23) 26:12 103:14 (12:22) 26:10 (12:22) 26:10 (12:12) 26:12 (12:12) 26:12	-	-				
operations 5:3 39:20 110:5 11:51:12 outset 18:12 61:4 262:3 263:22,24 211:13 216:11 pausing 102:25 68:23 109:19 136:23 37:1 151:5 124:6 228:20 260:4 Palace 1:4 239:1 6 23:6 6 27:9 129:13 16:51:5 pay 85:1 174:6 111:21 151:12 18 152:16 131:12 205:14 paper 60:15 103:14 257:4 26:12.23 pay 103:10 252: operative 171:18 156:24 16:14 238:16 249:12 parabolit 89:1 pace: 236:21:104 252:14 operator 7:17 8:3,16 184:13 188:16 over 1:21:61 12:8 over 1:21:61 12:8 39:13 46:10 17:24 218:13 26:12 10:43 218:25 219:16 31:15 64:473:1 200:11:02:32 22:23:22:19:16 133:12 18:15 34:21 66:12:24:25 73:6 174:21 178:11 216:73:20:72:2 247:23:2 31:15 64:473:1 200:11:02:20:12:26:7 76:34:97:17:10:8 134:15 13:6:0 particus 138:7 peaceful 73:24 218:25:21 09:10 parties 24:16;17:4:29:12:22:10:7:10 13:15 64:47:31: 220:12:22:10:10 134:15 13:6:20:10 134:12 13:0:0:11 73:5:25:10:28:11 126:21 10:22:10:10:10 particus 138:7 peaceful 73:29:12:2:11 126:21 10:22:10:10:10 11:				paid 252:9		
4.09 (3:13,23 (6:10) 127:14 132:15 1246 (228:02.06).4 Palace 14. 229:16 (238) (2.1,2) pay 88:11746 68:23 109:19 136:23 137:115 outside 111:23 113:24 paper 328:9,11 269:22 (28:10) pay 88:11746 0perator 7:17 83:16 156:12 (14:32) 238:16 (24:11) 241:12 (25:14) 269:22 (28:10) pay 88:11746 0perator 7:17 83:16 167:17 174:5 200:61 238:16 (24:12) paragraph 29:5 particularly 4:25 15:4 PCA 1:3 0perator 7:17 83:16 188:13 188:16 133:12 18:15 34:47 (23:17:21) 200:12 (23:22 (23:22) 22:14 (23:17:21) 200:12 (23:22 (23:22) 24:12 (21:17:23) 240:32 (27:22) 24:12 (21:17:23) 24:13 (23:17:21) 218:25 (21:16) 200:18 (20:33:22) 218:25 (21:16) 10:16 (15:00) 218:25 (21:16) 218:25 (21:16) 218:25 (21:16) 11:12 (21:17:23) 24:12 (21:17:12) 24:12 (21:17:12) 24:12 (21:17:12) 24:12 (21:16) 23:17:14 (21:16) 23:16 (12:22:17) 76:34:97:71 (10:18) 23:16 (12:22:17) 76:34:97:71 (10:18) 23:16 (12:22:17) 76:34:97:71 (10:18) 23:17:17 23:17:14 (21:17) 23:17:14 (21:17) 23:12 (21:11) 23:12 (21:	•	-		Pakistani 245:24		
409 63:13.23 66:10 127:14 132:15 124:6 228:20 260:4 Paner 1:4 229:16 233:6 247:9 129:13 165:15 111:21 151:12.18 152:16 131:12 205:14 paper 60:15 103:14 paper 62:15 103:14 paper 60:15 103:14	•			262:3 263:22,24		. 0
68:23 109:19 136:23 137:1 151:5 outside 111:23 113:24 paper 60:15 103:14 257:4 261:21.23 pay 85:1 174:6 0perative 171:18 156:24 161:4 238:16 249:12 parabolic 89:1 269:25 252:14 Parteulary 4:25:15 Parteulary 4:25:15:16 Parteulary 4:25:15:16:16 Parteulary 4:25:15:16:16 Parteulary 4:25:15:16:16 Parteulary 4:25:15:16:16 Parteulary 4:25:15:16:16:17:16:17:16:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:	40:9 63:13,23 66:10	127:14 132:15	124:6 228:20 260:4		229:16 233:6 247:9	129:13 165:15
111:12 151:12 18 152:16 131:12 205:14 papers 2589,11 262:2 28:10 paying 103:10 252: 179:20 189:9 167:17 174:5 260:6 parabolic 89:1 parabolic 89:1 paratori 189:1 269:25 252:14 PCA 1:3 244:16.20 178:10 181:4 over 1:21 6:11 28: 39:13 46:10 57:24 209:25 22:13 26:12 10:43 peace 1:42 15:15.16 13:17 30:73 17.9 201:11,18 205:19 53:34:857.5 120:3 121:6,7 200:18 203:3.22 218:25 219:16 31:15 64:4 73:1 220:21 224:6 61:5 67:15 68:21 134:15 136:20 Particulars 138:7 peaceful 17:24:2 partics 24:16,174:9 partics 24:16,12 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 173:59:25 10:43 <td>68:23 109:19</td> <td>136:23 137:1 151:5</td> <td>outside 111:23 113:24</td> <td></td> <td>257:4 261:21,23</td> <td>pay 85:1 174:6</td>	68:23 109:19	136:23 137:1 151:5	outside 111:23 113:24		257:4 261:21,23	pay 85:1 174:6
operative 171:18 156:24 161:4 238:16 29:12 parabolic 89:1 269:25 252:14 179:20 189:9 167:17 174:5 206:6 over 1:21 61 12:8 39:13 46:10 57:24 21:326:12 104:3 peace 1:4 215:15.16 243:16 20:7 178:8:10 184:13 188:16 133:12 18:15 34:21 66:12.24.25 73:6 71:42:11 78:11 21:67.82 17:21 240:3 267:20 247:23 31:15 64:4 73:1 220:12 22:4 61:5 67:15 68:21 134:15 13:66:20 particularly 4:25 15:4 peace 1:4 21:51:51.6 38:19 92:19 55:3 220:12 22:4 61:16 7:17 19:74:16 75:20.23 240:3 267:20 247:23 38:19 92:19 55:3 226:12 227:1 76:3:49.77:10.18 198:21 60:07:16 particularly 4:41:21 34:52:16 4:8 17:3:5 95:25 10:48 154:17 233:13 23:41:5 84:24 96:9 99:12 24:14 24:51:5 977.23 98:2 117:14 12:42:21 12:20 12:21 17:12 12:21 17:12 12:21 17:12 12:21 17:14 12:22:14:23 12:21 17:14 12:22:14:23 12:21 17:14 12:22:14:23 12:21 17:14 12:22:14:23 12:21 17:14 12:22:14:23 12:22:14:23 12:21:12:21 12:21:14:23 12:21:14:23 <td>111:21</td> <td>151:12,18 152:16</td> <td>131:12 205:14</td> <td></td> <td>262:2 268:10</td> <td>paying 103:10 252:12</td>	111:21	151:12,18 152:16	131:12 205:14		262:2 268:10	paying 103:10 252:12
17:20 189:9 167:17174:5 20:6 paragraphs 39:5 particularly 4:25 PCA 1:3 0perator 7:17 8:3.16 184:13 188:16 13:3.12 18:15 34:21 66:12.24.25 73:6 22:13 26:12 104:3 peace 1:4 215:15.16 8:22,23,24 9:7.10 191:16.25 2004.7 45:24 46:20 47:15 120:3 121:6,7 200:18 203:3.22 218:25 219:16 31:15 6:44 73:1 220:21 224:6 61:5 67:15 68:21 134:15 136:20 Particulars 138:7 peace ful 73:24 77:14 78:16 192:1.2 226:12 227:1 76:3.49 77:10.18 138:12 20 139:22 190:10 44:12.13 45:21 468 112:20 184 561 106:16 15:0.2 230:22 328:23 181:42 20 239:23 240:7 46:13 60:26 61:12 73:5 95:25 10:43 0prinon 180:0.20 37:12.12 238:23 100:22 103:12 249:17 97:7.23 98:2 117:14 124:22 125:14.23 186:15 20:1:4 239:71/2 12.38:23 107:19 108:11 129:14 22:15:14 130:7.24/25 10:22 107:10 139:12 168:12 130:7.24/25 130:7.24/25 130:7.24/25 130:7.24/25 131:13:16:12 130:12:14:11 130:12:14:11 130:14:11:14:11 120:22:10:10	operative 171:18	156:24 161:4	238:16 249:12		269:25	252:14
244:16.20 178:10 181:4 over 12:16:11:28 37:13:46:10:57:24 12:21:32:61:21:04:3 peace 1:42:15:15:16 operator 7:17 8:3.16 184:13 188:16 13:3.12 18:15 34:21 13:3.12 18:15 34:21 13:15:16:12:24:27:37:6 17:42:17:81:17 21:67:82:17:23 24:0:3 20:3:22:22 21:82:5:19:16 31:15 64:47 3:1 20:11:18 20:19 53:3 54:8 55:7.9 122:17 12:73:23 24:0:3 20:22 24:7:23 particulars 13:87 peaceful 17:3:24 77:14 78:16 79:1.19 22:3:3.25 22:610 71:9 74:16 75:20.23 149:22 190:10 particulars 13:87 peaceful 17:3:24 73:59 55:25 104:8 154:17 23:16 19:23:62:2 20:0:21 03:12 249:17 particulars 23:11:11 12:20 18:35 11:12:20 12:14:23 154:17 23:51:61 9:23:62:2 20:0:21 03:12 249:17 particulars 23:11:11 13:3:12:13:17:12:22 13:3:17:13:17:12:22 13:3:17:13:17:12:22 13:3:17:13:17:12:22 13:3:17:13:17:12:22 13:3:17:13:17:12:22 13:3:17:13:17:12:22 13:3:17:13:17:12:22 13:3:17:13:17:12:22 13:3:11:17:13:17:12:23 13:3:13:17:13:17:13:12 13:3:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13	-			-		
operator 7:17 8:3.16 18:413 188:16 13:3.12 18:15 34:21 60:12 (2.42.57):36 17:421 178:11 216:7.8 217:21 8:22,23,24 97,10 191:16,25 200:4,7 45:24 46:20 47:15 120:3 121:6,7 200:18 203:3,22 218:25 219:16 31:15 64:4 73:1 220:21 224:6 61:5 67:15 68:21 13:41:5 13:620 Particulars 138:7 peaceful 173:24 77:14 78:16 220:22 23:23 81:424 83:12,20 239:23 240:7 46:13 60:20 61:12 73:5 95:25 10:48.8 154:17 233:13 234:15 84:2 96:9 99:12 24:11 42:13 8:15 40:11 73:5 95:25 10:48.8 112:20 18:4 56:1 156:17 233:13 234:15 84:2 96:9 99:12 24:11 42:14 23:15:1 73:5 95:25 10:48.8 113:17 12:22 10:17:10 105:22 107:10 opinion 180:10.20 237:12,12 238:23 100:79 108:41 13:1 parallel 204:18 23:51 118:3 129:61 72:2 126:13,17 128:23 239:17 241:11,17,19 242:1 13:3:21 137:19,22 parallel 204:18 23:51 172:24 174:1 130:72,42.5 139:18 107:16 239:17 247:11 249:23 145:20 149:17 25:14 22:52:11 154:21 16:07 184:15 18:28,19 139:19:18 139					1 2	
bit bit <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td>	-					-
13:17 30:7 31:7.9 201:11,18 205:19 53:3 54:8 55:7.9 122:17 127:33 240:3 267:20 247:23 31:15 64:4 73:1 220:21 224:6 61:5 67:15 68:21 134:15 136:20 Particulars 138:7 peaceful 173:24 88:19 92:21 95:23 226:12 227:1 76:3,49 77:10,18 198:2,16 207:16 44:12,13 45:21 46:8 11:2,20 184 56:1 106:16 150:22 230:22 232:23 81:4,24 83:12,20 239:23 240:7 65:18 67:24 70:21 105:22 107:10 option 180:10,20 237:12,12 238:23 100:22 103:12 249:17 65:18 67:24 70:21 105:22 107:10 option 180:10,20 237:12,12 238:23 100:22 103:12 249:17 71:72:39 82:117:14 124:22 125:14,23 225:22 226:1 241:11,17,19 24:1 133:21 137:119:22 parameter 121:9,11 177:17:25 178:12 peaking 7:25 8:1 239:17 242:12,17,19 140:12 142:22 parameter 32:1,2 186:10,14,23:24 134:15 139:1 93:15 145:21 160:7 180:24 182:9,20 139:9,18 107:16 opportunity 168:12 250:4 252:11 154:81 55:81 59:1 93:15 145:21 160:7 180:14 185:2,82.9 139:18 107:16 119:99:267:17 256:2 66:22 171:23 173:23 parce 203:25	•		-			
31:15 220:21 224:6 61:5 67:15 68:21 11:1:1 13:20 Particulars 138:7 peaceful 173:24 77:14 78:16 79:1,19 225:23,25 226:10 71:9 74:16 75:0,23 149:22 19:0:10 parties 24:16,17 42:9 peaceful 173:24 88:19 92:19 52:3 230:02 232:23 81:4,24 83:12,20 239:23 240:7 44:13,15 46:21 46:13 73:5 95:25 104:8 opinion 180:10,20 237:12,12 238:23 100:22 103:12 249:17 97:7,23 98:2 117:14 126:13,17 128:23 239:72 226:1 241:11,17,19 242:1 133:21 137:19,22 parameter 421:5,11 177:24 74:1 130:7,24,25 29pinon 192:18 247:11 249:23 145:20 149:17 60:21 66:4 92:19 177:17,25 178:12 peaking 7:25 8:1 opinons 192:18 247:11 249:23 145:20 149:17 60:21 66:4 92:19 139:18 107:16 139:18 107:16 oppoet unity 168:12 250:12 66:17 159:12 168:3 199:12 100:7 184:15 185:28,19 139:18 107:16 optima 36:14 37:22 255:10 256:17 159:12 168:3 199:20 20:20 184:15 185:28,19 139:18 107:16 optima 36:14 37:22 255:10 256:17				-	-	
17:14 78:16 79:1.19 225:32.52 226:10 71:9 74:16 75:20.23 149:22 190:10 parties 24:16.17 42:9 peak 7:22 9:12.22 88:19 92:21 95:23 226:12 227:1 76:3.4.9 77:10.18 198:2.16 207:16 44:12.13 45:21 46:8 11:2.20 18:4 56:1 106:16 150:22 230:22 232:23 81:4.24 83:12.20 239:23 240.7 46:13 60:20 61:10 73:5 95:25 10:4:8 operator's 152:18 237:12,12 238:23 100:22 100:12 92:17 97:7.23 98:2117.11 124:22 125:14,22 opinion 180:10,20 237:12,12 238:23 107:9 108:4 113:1 parameter 121:9.11 177:17.17,25 178:12 130:7.24,25 225:22 226:1 241:11 (7,19 42:21 133:21 137:19,22 145:20 149:17 66:16 49:21:9 180:71.44:1 100:25 11.8 12:12 opportunity 168:12 250:4 25:11 154:18 15:8 159:1 93:15 145:21 160:7 184:15 185:2,8,19 127:10 131:13 39:9 269:21,24 255:10 256:17 159:12 168:3 parta<23:16		-				
88:19 92:21 95:23 226:12 227:1 76:34,9 77:10.18 198:2,16 207:16 44:12,13 45:21 46:8 11:2,20 18:45 561 106:16 150:22 230:22 23:23 81:4,24 83:12,20 239:23 240:7 46:13 60:20 61:12 73:5 95:25 104:8 operator's 152:18 235:16,19 236:22 100:22 103:12 242:14 245:15 65:18 67:24 70:21 105:22 107:10 opinion 180:10,20 237:12,12 238:23 107:9 108:4 113:1 249:17 977.23 98:2 117:14 124:22 125:14 23 239:17 24:12,13 240:24 114:8 115:8 127:18 241:24 251:5 77:24 98:21 100:7,24,25 opinions 192:18 247:11 249:23 145:20 149:17 60:21 66:4 92:19 107:24 178:1 parameters 42:1,2 178:24 179:32,32 107:9 118:12:12 opinions 192:18 247:11 249:23 145:20 149:17 60:21 66:4 92:19 100:24 182:23:10 102:11:13 127:10 131:13 193:2 92:02:1,24 250:12 C56:17 256:6 266:22 171:23 173:23 188:12 187:16,25 118 21:12 107:10 131:13 optimum 36:14 37:22 others 152:11 184:4 199:20 210:20 133:24 19:410:25 188:12:415 185:28,19 120:23 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>134:15 136:20</td> <td></td> <td>-</td>				134:15 136:20		-
106:16 150:22 230:22 232:23 81:4,24 83:12,20 239:23 240:7 46:13 60:20 61:12 73:5 95:25 104:8, 154:17 233:13 234:15 84:2 96:9 99:12 249:17 97:7.23 98:21 17:14 105:22 107:10 operator's 152:18 235:16,19 236:22 100:22 103:12 249:17 97:7.23 98:21 17:14 124:22 125:14,23 opinion 180:10,20 237:12,12 238:23 107:9 108:4 113:1 parallel 204:18 235:1 118:3 129:6 172:2 126:13,17 128:23 186:15 201:14 239:7,12,13 240:24 114:8 1158 127:18 parameter 121:9,11 parameter 121:9,11 parameter 121:9,11 parameter 42:1,2 178:24 179:23,25 10:25 11:8 12:12 opportunity 168:12 250:4 250:17 159:12 168:3 parameter 21:9,11 184:15 185:28,19 127:10 131:13 193:9 269:21,24 255:10 256:17 159:12 168:3 parameter 263:17 poilo 19:29 193:2 peeged 54:12 58:1 optimise 37:3 94:22 others 152:11 184:4 199:20 210:20 part 3:20 4:21 7:10,18 24:12 218:20 peaks 9:23 10:5 13:27 optimise 37:3 94:22 0thers 152:11 18:44 169:10 253:22 263:7 233:29:2 31:8 242:12 24	-	-		149:22 190:10	-	-
154:17 233:13 234:15 84:2 96:9 99:12 242:14 245:15 65:18 67:24 70:21 105:22 107:10 operator's 152:18 235:16,19 236:22 100:21 03:12 242:14 245:15 97:7,23 98:21 17:14 124:22 125:14,23 opinion 180:10,20 237:12,12 238:23 107:9 108:4 113:1 parallel 204:18 235:1 118:3 129:6 17:22 126:13,17 128:23 ats:15 201:14 239:7,12,13 240:24 114:8 115:8 127:18 parameter 121:9,11 177:17.25 178:12 peaking 7:25 8:1 239:17 244:12 (21,71.9 140:12 14:22 parameter 32:1,2 178:24 174:1 130:7,24,25 opportunity 168:12 250:0 256:17 159:12 168:3 parameter 32:1,0 18:01.43,2,24 234:6 25:13,20 oppised 257:17 265:6 266:22 171:23 173:23 parameter 203:25 186:10,14,23,24 234:6 25:13,20 optimis 37:3 94:22 023:33:24 257:15 229:24 245:2 13:24 19:6,24 22:11 19:12 10:53 129:14 10:25 peak 9:23 10:51:3 optimis 47:3 94:22 04ther 18:21:11 84:4 19:20 210:20 partiament 263:17 19:19 19:29 193:2 pegg 24:15:24 optimis 87:3 94:22 04ther 161				198:2,16 207:16	-	
operator's 152:18 235:16,19 236:22 100:22 103:12 249:17 97:7,23 98:2 117:14 124:22 125:14,23 opinion 180:10,20 237:12,12 238:23 107:9 108:4 113:1 parallel 204:18 235:1 118:3 129:6 172:2 126:13,17 128:23 225:22 226:1 241:11,17,19 242:1 133:21 137:19,22 parallel 204:18 235:1 178:24 179:23,25 102:25 118:12:12 opinions 192:18 247:11 249:23 145:20 1049:17 60:21 66:492:19 188:24 179:23,25 102:55 113:12 parameters 42:1,2 178:24 179:23,25 139:18 107:16 opportunity 168:12 250:4 252:11 154:18 155:8 159:1 93:15 145:21 160:7 184:15 185:2,8,19 127:10 131:13 193:9 269:21,24 255:10 256:17 159:12 168:3 parel 203:25 186:10,14,23,24 224:6 259:13,20; 15: 3 optimal 36:14 37:22 others 152:11 184:4 199:20 210:20 part 3:20 4:21 7:10,18 194:21,22 198:20 pegged 54:12 58:1 optimise 97:3 94:22 optimise 19:11 211:6 1257 226:20 81:14 10:25 226:32 054:18 pending 243:20 optimise 97:3 94:22 optimise 37:3 94:22 optimise 37:3 94:22 optimise 37:3 94:22 opti			81:4,24 83:12,20	239:23 240:7		73:5 95:25 104:8,25
opinion 180:10,20237:12,12 238:23107:9 108:4 113:1parallel 204:18 235:1118:3 129:6 172:2126:13,17 128:23186:15 201:14239:7,12,13 240:24114:8 115:8 127:18241:11,17,19 242:1133:21 137:19.22241:24 251:5177:17,25 178:12peaking 7:25 8:1239:17242:12,17,19140:12 142:22parameter 321:9,2178:24 179:23,2510:25 11:8 12:12opinions 192:18247:11 249:23145:20 149:1760:21 66:4 92:19180:24 182:9,20139,18 107:16opportmity 168:12250:4 252:11154:11 558: 159:193:15 145:21 160:7184:15 185:2,8,19127:10 131:13193:9 269:21,24255:10 256:17159:12 168:3parale 203:25186:10,14,23,24234:6 259:13,20,optosed 257:17265:6 266:22171:23 173:23paral 20:421 7:10.18194:12,122 198:20pegged 54:12 58:195:17 114:14216:18 219:11211:6 215:7 226:2081:9:14 10:25206:6 208:23 209:9120:2395:17 114:14216:18 219:11211:6 215:7 226:2081:9:14 10:25206:6 208:23 209:9120:239timum 38:8 94:1341:14 61:11 116:4265:13 271:1541:17 44:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18pending 243:20optimum 38:8 94:1341:14 61:11 116:4265:13 271:1541:17 14:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18pending 243:20options 69:24ourselves 101:6,21overarching 58:578:17,20,25 80:12partner 25:13.15per 33:16 40:13,19,ortal y253:22out 28:4:10 18:8 19:3overarching 58:578:17,20,25 80:12partner 25:21:3,15per 33:16 4	154:17	233:13 234:15	84:2 96:9 99:12	242:14 245:15	65:18 67:24 70:21	
opinion 180:10,20 237:12,12 238:23 107:9 108:4 113:1 parallel 204:18 235:1 118:3 129:6 172:2 126:13,17 128:23 186:15 201:14 239:7,12,13 240:24 114:8 115:8 127:18 241:11,17,19 242:1 133:21 137:19,22 239:17 242:12,17,19 140:12 142:22 parameter 121:9,11 177:17,25 178:12 peaking 7:25 8:1 opinons 192:18 247:11 249:23 145:20 149:17 60:21 66:4 92:19 180:24 182:9,20 139,18 107:16 opportunity 168:12 250:4 252:11 154:18 155:8 159:1 93:15 145:21 160:7 184:15 185:2,8,19 127:10 131:13 258:25 262:5 271:20 183:17 193:17,19 paratimetr 263:17 190:19 192:9 193:2 peggd 54:12 58:1 optimal 36:14 37:22 others 152:11 184:4 199:20 210:20 part 3:20 4:21 7:10,18 194:21,22 198:20 pegged 54:12 58:1 optimis 37:3 94:22 223:3,24 257:15 229:24 245:22 132:24 19:6,24 22:11 215:17 218:25 pending 243:20 optimise 37:3 94:22 03:31 41:18 248:6 overarching 58:5 78:17,20,25 80:12 parts 25:42:2 part 3:2:6 421:2 48:10 part 3:2:6 421:2 48:10 part 3:2:6 421:2 48:10 p	operator's 152:18	235:16,19 236:22		249:17	97:7,23 98:2 117:14	124:22 125:14,23
186:15 201:14 239:7,12,13 240:24 114:8 115:8 127:18 241:24 251:5 172:24 174:1 130:7,24,25 225:22 226:1 241:11,7,19 242:1 133:21 137:19,22 parameter 121:9,11 177:17,25 178:12 peaking 7:25 8:1 239:7 242:12,17,19 140:12 142:22 parameter 32:1,2 178:24 179:23,25 10:25 11:8 12:12 opinions 192:18 247:11 249:23 145:20 149:17 60:21 66:4 92:19 186:10.14,23,24 234:6 259:13,20 oppotunity 168:12 250:4 252:11 154:81 155:8 159:1 93:15 145:21 160:7 186:10.14,23,24 234:6 259:13,20 opposed 257:17 265:6 266:22 171:23 173:23 parcel 203:25 186:10.14,23,24 234:6 259:13,20 optimal 51:14 37:22 20thers 152:11 184:4 199:20 210:20 partel 203:25 186:10.14,23,24 234:6 259:13,20 optimise 37:3 94:22 223:3,24 257:15 229:24 245:22 13:24 19:6,24 22:11 190:19 192:9 193:2 pegged 54:12 58:1 optimum 38:8 94:13 41:14 61:11 116:4 265:13 271:15 41:17 14:8 45:4 251:4 252:8 254:18 pencli 60:15 option 11:7 69:20,25 otherwise 8:4 14:10 253:22 247:8 73:277:12,19,20 partly 146:12 per 33:16 4	opinion 180:10,20	237:12,12 238:23	107:9 108:4 113:1		118:3 129:6 172:2	126:13,17 128:23
225:22226:1241:11,17,19242:12133:21137:19,22parameter 121:9,11177:17,25177:17,25178:12peaking 7:258:1239:17242:12,17,19140:12142:22parameters 42:1,260:21178:24179:23,2510:5511:812:12opportunity 168:12250:4250:4250:14155:15159:12168:393:15145:21160:7184:15185:28,19127:10131:13193:9269:21,24255:10256:17159:12168:3parcel203:25186:10,14,23,24234:6259:13,20opposed257:17265: 266:22171:23173:23park22:16187:16,25189:3,11peake 9:230:513:2optimal36:1437:22others152:11184:14199:20210:20park21:6187:16,25pegge54:1228:12optimise37:394:22233:3,24257:15229:24245:2213:2419:6,2422:1119:4:10:25pecdid06:0208:2309:120:23optimum38:894:1341:1461:11116:4265:1371:1541:1744:1744:1042:2224:2212:23254:22pecdid60:15perailing24:21248:10pens26:22pecdid60:15perailing24:2124:10160:15152:13152:13152:13152:13152:13152:13152:13152:13152:13152:13152	186:15 201:14	239:7,12,13 240:24	114:8 115:8 127:18		172:24 174:1	130:7,24,25
239:17242:12,17,19140:12 142:22parameters 42:1,2178:24 179:23,2510:25 11:8 12:12opinions 192:18247:11 249:23145:20 149:1760:21 66:4 92:19180:24 182:9,2013:9,18 107:16opportunity 168:12250:4 252:11154:18 155:8 159:193:15 145:21 160:7184:15 185:2,819127:10 131:13193:9 269:21,24255:10 256:17159:12 168:3parcel 203:25186:10,14,23,24234:6 259:13,20;opposed 257:17265:6 266:22171:23 173:23parcel 203:25187:16,25 189:3,11peaks 9:23 10:5 13:optimal 36:14 37:22others 152:11 184:4199:02 010:20partiament 263:17190:19 192:9 193:2peggd 54:12 58:1optimis 37:3 94:22023:3,24 257:15229:24 245:2213:24 19:6,24 22:11215:17 218:25pencil 60:15optimis 37:3 94:22023:3,24 257:15229:24 245:2213:24 19:6,24 22:11215:17 218:25pencil 60:15optimis 37:3 94:22023:3,24 257:15229:24 245:2213:24 19:6,24 22:11215:17 218:25pencil 60:15optimis 47:9otherwise 8:4 14:10253:12 71:1541:17 44:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18pencil 60:15optimis 69:9otherwise 8:4 14:10206:23122:2 247:873:277:12,19,20partimer 25:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,optims 69:4ourselves 101:6,21overall 31:9 58:847:14 57:1 72:21254:22partis 36:60:20 145:750:12,14,14 45:14orally 253:22out 2:8 4:10 18:8 19:3overfilled 164:15125:15 171:18parturers 254:19parturers 254:19partur	225:22 226:1	241:11,17,19 242:1	133:21 137:19,22		177:17,25 178:12	peaking 7:25 8:1
opinions 192:18247:11 249:23145:20 149:1760:21 66:4 92:19180:24 182:9,2013:9,18 107:16opportunity 168:12250:4 252:11154:18 155:8 159:193:15 145:21 160:7184:15 185:2,8,19127:10 131:13193:9 269:21,24255:10 256:17255:6 266:22171:23 173:23parcel 203:25186:10,14,23,24234:6 259:13,20;opposed 257:17265:6 266:22171:23 173:23part 32:0 4:21 7:10,18187:16.25 189:3,11peaks 9:23 10:5 13:258:25 262:5271:20183:17 193:17,19Partiament 263:17190:19 192:9 193:2pegged 54:12 58:1optimise 37:3 94:22223:3,24 257:15229:24 245:2223:3 29:2 31:8242:12 248:10pecks 23:09:9120:23optimise 37:3 94:220therwise 8:4 14:10253:22 263:723:3 29:2 31:8242:12 248:10pending 243:20optimum 38:8 94:1341:14 61:11 116:4265:13 271:1541:17 44:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18people 67: 9:24 10:162:11260:23122:2 247:873:2 77:12,19,20partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,option 17:7209:18 228:25188:24111:10 114:12partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,ordl 37:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overflud 164:15135:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overflud 164:15135:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overflud 164:15135:15 171:18145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4139:2 22:2 240:8 24:4: </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>10:25 11:8 12:12,22</td>			-	-	-	10:25 11:8 12:12,22
opportunity 168:12250:4 252:11154:18 155:8 159:193:15 145:21 160:7184:15 185:2,8,19127:10 131:13193:9 269:21,24255:10 256:17159:12 168:3parcel 203:25186:10,14,23,24234:6 259:13,20,0opposed 257:17265:6 266:22171:23 173:23parcel 203:25187:16,25 189:3,11peaks 9:23 10:5 13:optimal 36:14 37:22others 152:11 184:4199:20 210:20part 3:20 4:21 7:10,18190:19 192:9 193:2pegge 34:12 58:195:17 114:14216:18 219:11211:6 215:7 226:208:1 9:14 10:25206:6 208:23 209:9120:23optimised 95:9otherwise 8:4 14:10253:22 263:7233:29:2 31:8242:12 248:10pending 243:20optims 38:8 94:1341:14 61:11 116:4265:13 271:1541:17 44:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18pending 243:20option 11:7 69:20,25130:3 141:18 248:6overall 31:9 58:847:14 57:1 72:21254:22people 6:7 9:24 10::1162:11260:23122:2 247:873:2 77:12,19,20partiner 252:13.15per 33:16 40:13,19,option 11:7209:18 228:25188:24111:10 114:12partner 252:13.15per 33:16 40:13,19,ordal 75:720:230verarching 58:578:17.20,25 80:12partner 252:13.15per 33:16 40:13,19,ordal 71:7209:18 228:25188:24113:10 14:12partner 254:1944:10 47:4 48:12ordal 3:5 87:4 128:20198 21:18,19,21overaflug 149:8135:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overflug 149:713				-	· · · · ·	
193:9 269:21,24255:10 256:17159:12 168:3Jaccl 203:25186:10,14,23,24234:6 259:13,20,2opposed 257:17265:6 266:22171:23 173:23parcel 203:25187:16,25 189:3,11peaks 9:23 10:5 13:258:25 262:5271:20183:17 193:17,19173:17,19part 32:0 4:21 7:10,18190:19 192:9 193:2peggd 54:12 58:1optimal 36:14 37:22others 152:11 184:4199:20 210:20part 3:20 4:21 7:10,18194:21,22 198:20peggd 54:12 58:1optimise 37:3 94:22223:3,24 257:15229:24 245:2233:24 19:6,24 22:11215:17 218:25pending 243:20optimise 37:3 94:22otherwise 8:4 14:10253:22 263:723:3 29:2 31:8242:12 248:10pending 243:20optims 17: 69:20,25130:3 141:18 248:6overall 31:9 58:847:14 57:1 7:21:2254:22partis 3:6 36:20 145:7per 33:16 40:13,19,options 69:24ourselves 101:6,21overaftille 164:1578:17,20,25 80:12partis 3:6 36:20 145:750:12,14,14 56:1,ordar 3: 58 7:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfillen 164:15135:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfillen 164:15135:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfillen 164:15135:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfillen 164:15139:14,22 140:6,7170:3 175:9 197:2286:4 101:14 105:1139:12 22:2 240:8 244:463:16 65:23 68:6overfillen 164:15200:24 203:25 </td <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	-					
opposed 257:17265:6 266:22171:23 173:23park 32:16187:16,25 189:3,11peaks 9:23 10:5 13:258:25 262:5271:20183:17 193:17,19park 32:16190:19 192:9 193:2pegged 54:12 58:1optimisa 36:14 37:22others 152:11 184:4199:20 210:20part 3:20 4:21 7:10,18194:21,22 198:20pegged 54:12 58:1optimise 37:3 94:22223:3,24 257:15229:24 245:2213:24 19:6,24 22:11215:17 218:25pending 243:20optimise 95:9otherwise 8:4 14:10253:22 263:723:3 29:2 31:8242:12 248:10pending 243:20option 11:7 69:20,25130:3 141:18 248:6overall 31:9 58:847:14 57:1 72:21254:22people 6:7 9:24 10:162:11260:23overall 31:9 58:847:14 57:1 72:21254:22people 6:7 9:24 10:options 69:24ourselves 101:6,21overarching 58:578:17,20,25 80:12partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,orall 253:22out 2:8 4:10 18:8 19:3overfilled 164:15125:8 127:24partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfilled 164:1513:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:413:1:1 36:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfilled 164:15155:15 171:18145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:413:1:1 36:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfilled 229:21176:6 179:21 189:9174:5 179:4 186:1756:25 58:18 73:413:1:1 36:1422:2 27:13 36:6overfilled 229:21155:15 171:18120:12 66:13120:14 105:14 165:1513:1:1 36:1429:32						
258:25271:20183:17 193:17,19Parlia 52:10190:19 192:9 193:2pegged 54:12 58:1optimal 36:14 37:22others 152:11 184:4199:20 210:20Parliament 263:17194:21,22 198:20120:2395:17 114:14216:18 219:11211:6 215:7 226:208:1 9:14 10:25206:6 208:23 209:9120:23optimise 37:3 94:22223:3,24 257:15229:24 245:2213:24 19:6,24 22:11215:17 218:25pendid 60:15optimise 95:9otherwise 8:4 14:10253:22 263:723:3 29:2 31:8242:12 248:10pendig 243:20option 11:7 69:20,25130:3 141:18 248:6overall 31:9 58:847:14 57:1 72:21254:22people 6:7 9:24 10::162:11260:23122:2 247:873:2 77:12,19,20partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,oral 171:7209:18 228:25188:24111:10 114:12partner s25:19per 33:16 40:13,19,order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfilled 164:15125:8 127:24parts 3:6 36:20 145:750:12,14,14 45:12,131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfilled 149:7139:14,22 140:6,7170:3 175:9 197:2286:4 101:14 105:150:25 188:2342:7 46:24 47:17160:22 164:7140:11 149:20198:4 207:3121:17 125:16194:8 203:1349:3 55:18 59:3,8165:10155:15 171:18part 61:25 62:3126:11 127:13229:22 240:8 244:463:16 65:23 68:6overifilded 229:21175:6 179:21 189:9174:5 179:4 186:17132:3 148:6 155:194:8 203:1349:3 55:18 59:3,8165:10155:15 171:18pa	-			-		
optimal 36:14 37:22 95:17 114:14others 152:11 184:4 216:18 219:11199:20 210:20 210:20part 3:20 4:21 7:10,18 part 3:20 4:21 7:10,18194:21,22 198:20 206:6 208:23 209:9pegs 24:1 51:24 120:23optimise 37:3 94:22 optimise 95:9223:3,24 257:15 otherwise 8:4 14:10229:24 245:22 253:22 263:713:24 19:6,24 22:11 23:3 29:2 31:8215:17 218:25 242:12 248:10pendig 243:20 pendig 243:20optimum 38:8 94:13 option 11:7 69:20,2541:14 61:11 116:4 260:23265:13 271:15 122:2 247:841:17 44:8 45:4 73:2 77:12,19,20251:4 252:8 254:18 partner 252:13,15pendig 243:20 pendig 243:20options 69:24 oral 171:7 oral 171:7209:18 228:25 19:8 21:18,19,21overarching 58:5 188:2478:17,20,25 80:12 122:2 247:8partner 252:13,15 78:17,20,25 80:12per 33:16 40:13,19, partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19, per 33:16 40:13,19, partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19, partner 252:13,15order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21 0verfilled 164:15overfilling 149:8 135:17 138:18,20145:14 169:10 156:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:14 122:2 247:822:2 27:13 36:2 0verfilled 164:15overfilling 149:8 135:17 138:18,20145:14 169:10 198:4 207:356:25 58:18 73:4 121:7 125:1619:4:8 203:13 270:1749:3 55:18 59:3,8 165:10165:10155:15 171:18 155:15 171:18partle 25:62:3 166:10126:11 127:13 123:3 148:15,16orders 132:16 251:11 270:1769:29:21 101:9 73:8 79:16 81:15overfilled 229:21 259:16156:10 259:25120:22 240:8 25:17,20,23 226:25 226:9,10,12223:						-
95:17 114:14216:18 219:11211:6 215:7 226:2081:9:04 10:10;16206:6 208:23 209:9120:23optimise 37:3 94:22223:3,24 257:15229:24 245:2213:24 19:6,24 22:11215:17 218:25pendig 243:20optimise 95:9otherwise 8:4 14:10253:22 263:723:3 29:2 31:8242:12 248:10pendig 243:20optim 38:8 94:1341:14 61:11 116:4265:13 271:1541:17 44:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18pendig 243:20option 11:7 69:20,25130:3 141:18 248:6overall 31:9 58:847:14 57:1 72:21254:22people 6:7 9:24 10::1options 69:24ourselves 101:6,21overarching 58:578:17,20,25 80:12partner 252:13,15perts 33:16 40:13,19,oral 171:7209:18 228:25188:24111:10 114:12partner 252:13,15pet 44:10 47:4 48:12,order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfilled 164:15125:8 127:24parts 3:6 36:20 145:750:12,14,14 56:1,order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfilled 164:7139:14,22 140:6,7170:3 175:9 197:2286:4 101:14 105:19:48 203:1349:3 55:18 59:3,8165:10155:15 171:18party 61:25 62:3126:11 127:1319:48 203:1349:3 55:18 59:3,8165:10155:15 198:12186:20 188:15,16159:15,16 161:240rders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23223:250rders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23223:250rders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16			· · · · · ·			
optimise 37:3 94:22223:3,24 257:15229:24 245:2213:24 19:6,24 22:11215:17 218:25pencil 60:15optimised 95:9otherwise 8:4 14:10253:22 263:723:3 29:2 31:8242:12 248:10pending 243:20optim 38:8 94:1341:14 61:11 116:4265:13 271:1541:17 44:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18pending 243:20option 11:7 69:20,25130:3 141:18 248:6overall 31:9 58:847:14 57:1 72:21254:22people 6:7 9:24 10:1162:11260:23122:2 247:873:2 77:12,19,20partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,options 69:24ourselves 101:6,21overarching 58:578:17,20,25 80:12partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,orall 71:7209:18 228:25188:24111:10 114:12partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfilling 149:80verfilling 149:8135:17 138:18,20170:3 175:9 197:2286:4 101:14 105:113:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfilling 149:7139:14,22 140:6,7170:3 175:9 197:2286:4 101:14 105:119:48 203:1349:3 55:18 59:3,8165:10155:15 171:18party 61:25 62:3126:11 127:13229:22 240:8 244:463:16 65:23 68:6overlifiled 229:21175:5 198:12186:20 188:15,16159:15,16 161:240rders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23223:25orders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23223:250rders 132:16 251:1189:2 93					-	10
optimised 95:9 optimum 38:8 94:13otherwise 8:4 14:10253:22 263:7 253:22 263:723:3 29:2 31:8 23:3 29:2 31:8242:12 248:10 251:4 252:8 254:18 251:4 252:8 254:18pending 243:20 pens 26:22option 11:7 69:20,25130:3 141:18 248:6 260:23overall 31:9 58:8 122:2 247:841:17 44:8 45:4 251:4 252:12 248:10251:4 252:8 254:18 254:22pendie 243:20options 69:24 oral 171:7ourselves 101:6,21 209:18 228:25overarching 58:5 188:2478:17,20,25 80:12 188:24partner 252:13,15 111:10 114:12per 33:16 40:13,19, 9artner 252:13,15order 3:5 87:4 128:20 131:1 136:1419:8 21:18,19,21 22:2 27:13 36:2overfilling 164:15 overfilling 149:8 131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2 22:2 71:13 36:2overfilling 149:8 149:8135:17 138:18,20 150:12 188:23145:14 169:10 164:756:25 58:18 73:4 139:14,22 140:6,7 170:3 175:9 197:2256:25 58:18 73:4 86:4 101:14 169:10194:8 203:13 229:22 240:8 244:4 orders 132:16 251:11 orders 132:16 251:11 89:2 93:2 101:9overfillated 229:21 259:16175:5 198:12 200:24 203:25186:20 188:15,16 209:6 225:17,20,23 225:25 226:9,10,12122:11 127:13 223:25ordinance 109:25 ordinance 109:25102:18 103:12 102:18 103:12overmuch 22:8 216:20 217:1120:26:29:10,12 225:25 226:9,10,12223:25 226:29:20 240:8 24:4 20:62 217:11225:25 226:9,10,12 225:25 226:9,10,12						
optimum 38:8 94:1341:14 61:11 116:4265:13 271:1541:17 44:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18pens 26:22option 11:7 69:20,25130:3 141:18 248:6overall 31:9 58:841:17 44:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18people 6:7 9:24 10:1162:11260:23122:2 247:873:2 77:12,19,20partly 146:12152:13options 69:24ourselves 101:6,21overarching 58:578:17,20,25 80:12partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,orall 71:7209:18 228:25188:24111:10 114:12partners 254:1944:10 47:4 48:12,order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfilled 164:15125:8 127:24parts 3:6 36:20 145:750:12,14,14 56:1,131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overflow 147:6 149:7139:14,22 140:6,7170:3 175:9 197:2286:4 101:14 105:1150:25 188:2342:7 46:24 47:17160:22 164:7140:11 149:20198:4 207:3121:17 125:16194:8 203:1349:3 55:18 59:3,8165:10155:15 171:18party 61:25 62:3126:11 127:13229:22 240:8 244:463:16 65:23 68:6overfinflated 229:21175:6 179:21 189:9174:5 179:4 186:17132:3 148:6 155:270:1773:8 79:16 81:15overflo 17:11:2:24195:5 198:12186:20 188:15,16159:15,16 161:24orders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23223:25ordinance 109:25102:18 103:12overmuch 22:8216:20 217:11225:25 226:9,10,12perceives 25:25	-	2		13:24 19:6,24 22:11		-
optimum 38:8 94:1341:14 61:11 116:4265:13 271:1541:17 44:8 45:4251:4 252:8 254:18pens 26:22option 11:7 69:20,25130:3 141:18 248:6overall 31:9 58:847:14 57:1 72:21254:22people 6:7 9:24 10:1162:11260:23122:2 247:873:2 77:12,19,20partly 146:12152:13options 69:24ourselves 101:6,21overarching 58:578:17,20,25 80:12partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,oral 171:7209:18 228:25188:24111:10 114:12partners 254:1944:10 47:4 48:12,order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfilled 164:15125:8 127:24145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfilled 149:7139:14,22 140:6,7170:3 175:9 197:2286:4 101:14 105:119:8 203:1349:3 55:18 59:3,8165:10155:15 171:18party 61:25 62:3126:11 127:13229:22 240:8 244:463:16 65:23 68:6overinflated 229:21175:6 179:21 189:9174:5 179:4 186:17132:3 148:6 155:270:1773:8 79:16 81:15overly 61:7 112:24195:5 198:12186:20 188:15,16159:15,16 161:24orders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23223:25ordinance 109:25102:18 103:12overmuch 22:8216:20 217:11225:25 226:9,10,12perceives 25:25orders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23223:25				23:3 29:2 31:8		. 0
option11:769:20,25130:3141:18248:6overall31:958:847:1457:172:21254:22people6:79:2410::162:11260:23122:2247:873:277:12,19,20parting146:12152:13152:13options69:24ourselves101:6,21overarching58:578:17,20,2580:12partner252:13,15per33:1640:13,19,oral77:12209:18228:25188:24111:10114:12partner254:1944:1044:1044:1444:10order35:57:4128:2019:821:18,19,21overfilling149:8135:17138:18,20145:14169:1056:2558:1856:2558:1856:2558:1856:14139:14,22140:6,7140:11149:1056:2558:1856:2558:1856:14155:15171:18121:7<						-
162:11260:23122:2 247:873:2 77:12,19,20partly 146:12152:13options 69:24ourselves 101:6,21overarching 58:578:17,20,25 80:12partner 252:13,15per 33:16 40:13,19,oral 171:7209:18 228:25188:24111:10 114:12partners 254:1944:10 47:4 48:12.order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfilled 164:15125:8 127:24parts 3:6 36:20 145:750:12,14,14 56:1.4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfilleng 149:803:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfilleng 149:8135:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 36:1422:2 27:13 36:2overfilleng 149:8135:17 138:18,20170:3 175:9 197:2286:4 101:14 105:1194:8 203:1349:3 55:18 59:3,8165:10155:15 171:18party 61:25 62:3126:11 127:13229:22 240:8 244:463:16 65:23 68:6overinflated 229:21175:6 179:21 189:9174:5 179:4 186:17132:3 148:6 155:270:1773:8 79:16 81:15overly 61:7 112:24195:5 198:12186:20 188:15,16159:15,16 161:24orders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23223:25ordinance 109:25102:18 103:12overnuch 22:8216:20 217:11225:25 226:9,10,12perceives 25:25	L					people 6:7 9:24 10:10
options 69:24 oral 171:7ourselves 101:6,21 209:18 228:25overarching 58:5 188:2478:17,20,25 80:12 111:10 114:12partner 252:13,15 partners 254:19per 33:16 40:13,19, 44:10 47:4 48:12orally 253:22 order 3:5 87:4 128:20out 2:8 4:10 18:8 19:3 19:8 21:18,19,21overfilled 164:15 overfilling 149:8 overfilling 149:8111:10 114:12 125:8 127:24partners 254:19 partners 254:1944:10 47:4 48:12 50:12,14,14 46:1.7131:1 136:14 131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2 22:2 27:13 36:2overfilling 149:8 overfilling 149:8 160:22 164:7135:17 138:18,20 139:14,22 140:6,7145:14 169:10 170:3 175:9 197:2256:25 58:18 73:4 86:4 101:14 105:1194:8 203:13 229:22 240:8 244:4 orders 132:16 251:1163:16 65:23 68:6 89:2 93:2 101:9overifilated 229:21 259:16175:6 179:21 189:9 195:5 198:12174:5 179:4 186:17 186:20 188:15,16132:3 148:6 155: 159:15,16 161:24 200:24 203:25orders 132:16 251:11 orders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9 259:16259:16 200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23 225:25 226:9,10,12223:25 26:9,10,12ordinance 109:25102:18 103:12 102:18 103:12overmuch 22:8 104:16 104:14 21:16216:20 217:11225:25 226:9,10,12perceives 25:25 216:20 217:11			122:2 247:8		partly 146:12	152:13
oral 171:7 209:18 228:25 188:24 171:1, 10, 114:12 partners 254:19 44:10 47:4 48:12, orally 253:22 out 2:8 4:10 18:8 19:3 overfilled 164:15 111:10 114:12 partners 254:19 44:10 47:4 48:12, order 3:5 87:4 128:20 19:8 21:18,19,21 overfilling 149:8 111:10 114:12 parts 3:6 36:20 145:7 50:12,14,14 56:1, 131:1 136:14 22:2 27:13 36:2 overflow 147:6 149:7 139:14,22 140:6,7 170:3 175:9 197:22 86:4 101:14 105: 150:25 188:23 42:7 46:24 47:17 160:22 164:7 140:11 149:20 198:4 207:3 121:7 125:16 194:8 203:13 49:3 55:18 59:3,8 165:10 155:15 171:18 party 61:25 62:3 126:11 127:13 229:22 240:8 244:4 63:16 65:23 68:6 overifilated 229:21 175:6 179:21 189:9 174:5 179:4 186:17 132:3 148:6 155:: 270:17 73:8 79:16 81:15 overly 61:7 112:24 200:24 203:25 209:6 225:17,20,23 223:25 ordinance 109:25 102:18 103:12 overmuch 22:8 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25	options 69:24	ourselves 101:6,21	overarching 58:5		partner 252:13,15	per 33:16 40:13,19,22
orally 253:22out 2:8 4:10 18:8 19:3overfilled 164:15fail: 11:10 11:12parts 3:6 36:20 145:750:12,14,14 56:1.1order 3:5 87:4 128:2019:8 21:18,19,21overfilling 149:8125:8 127:24145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4131:1 136:1422:2 27:13 36:2overflow 147:6 149:7133:17 138:18,20145:14 169:1056:25 58:18 73:4150:25 188:2342:7 46:24 47:17160:22 164:7140:11 149:20198:4 207:3121:7 125:16194:8 203:1349:3 55:18 59:3,8165:10155:15 171:18party 61:25 62:3126:11 127:13229:22 240:8 244:463:16 65:23 68:6overinflated 229:21175:6 179:21 189:9174:5 179:4 186:17132:3 148:6 155:270:1773:8 79:16 81:15overly 61:7 11:2:24195:5 198:12186:20 188:15,16159:15,16 161:24orders 132:16 251:1189:2 93:2 101:9259:16200:24 203:25209:6 225:17,20,23223:25ordinance 109:25102:18 103:12overnuch 22:8216:20 217:11225:25 226:9,10,12perceives 25:25	oral 171:7	209:18 228:25	188:24		partners 254:19	44:10 47:4 48:12,19
order 3:5 87:4 128:20 19:8 21:18,19,21 overfilling 149:8 145:14 169:10 56:25 58:18 73:4 131:1 136:14 22:2 22:13 36:2 overflow 147:6 149:7 135:17 138:18,20 145:14 169:10 56:25 58:18 73:4 150:25 188:23 42:7 46:24 47:17 160:22 164:7 140:11 149:20 198:4 207:3 121:7 125:16 194:8 203:13 49:3 55:18 59:3,8 165:10 155:15 171:18 party 61:25 62:3 126:11 127:13 229:22 240:8 244:4 63:16 65:23 68:6 overinflated 229:21 175:6 179:21 189:9 174:5 179:4 186:17 132:3 148:6 155: 270:17 73:8 79:16 81:15 overly 61:7 112:24 195:5 198:12 186:20 188:15,16 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>50:12,14,14 56:1,1</td></t<>						50:12,14,14 56:1,1
131:1 136:14 22:2 27:13 36:2 overflow 147:6 149:7 139:14,22 140:6,7 170:3 175:9 197:22 86:4 101:14 105: 150:25 188:23 42:7 46:24 47:17 160:22 164:7 140:11 149:20 198:4 207:3 121:7 125:16 194:8 203:13 49:3 55:18 59:3,8 165:10 155:15 171:18 party 61:25 62:3 126:11 127:13 229:22 240:8 244:4 63:16 65:23 68:6 overinflated 229:21 175:6 179:21 189:9 174:5 179:4 186:17 132:3 148:6 155: 270:17 73:8 79:16 81:15 overly 61:7 112:24 195:5 198:12 186:20 188:15,16 159:15,16 161:24 orders 132:16 251:11 89:2 93:2 101:9 259:16 200:24 203:25 209:6 225:17,20,23 223:25 ordinance 109:25 102:18 103:12 overmuch 22:8 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25	•				-	, , , ,
150:25 188:23 42:7 46:24 47:17 160:22 164:7 140:11 149:20 198:4 207:3 121:7 125:16 194:8 203:13 49:3 55:18 59:3,8 165:10 155:15 171:18 party 61:25 62:3 126:11 127:13 229:22 240:8 244:4 63:16 65:23 68:6 overinflated 229:21 175:6 179:21 189:9 174:5 179:4 186:17 132:3 148:6 155: 270:17 73:8 79:16 81:15 overly 61:7 112:24 195:5 198:12 186:20 188:15,16 159:15,16 161:24 orders 132:16 251:11 89:2 93:2 101:9 259:16 200:24 203:25 209:6 225:17,20,23 223:25 ordinance 109:25 102:18 103:12 overmuch 22:8 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25			8	-		
194:8 203:13 49:3 55:18 59:3,8 165:10 171:18 party 61:25 62:3 126:11 127:13 229:22 240:8 244:4 63:16 65:23 68:6 overinflated 229:21 155:15 171:18 party 61:25 62:3 126:11 127:13 270:17 73:8 79:16 81:15 overly 61:7 112:24 195:5 198:12 186:20 188:15,16 159:15,16 161:24 orders 132:16 251:11 89:2 93:2 101:9 259:16 200:24 203:25 209:6 225:17,20,23 223:25 ordinance 109:25 102:18 103:12 overmuch 22:8 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25						
229:22 240:8 244:4 63:16 65:23 68:6 overinflated 229:21 175:6 179:21 189:9 174:5 179:4 186:17 132:3 148:6 155:: 270:17 73:8 79:16 81:15 overly 61:7 112:24 195:5 198:12 186:20 188:15,16 159:15,16 161:24 orders 132:16 251:11 89:2 93:2 101:9 259:16 200:24 203:25 209:6 225:17,20,23 223:25 223:25 209:6 225:17,20,23 223:25 226:20 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:12 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 255:15 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:21 216:20 216:20						
270:17 73:8 79:16 81:15 overly 61:7 112:24 115:5 198:12 186:20 188:15,16 159:15,16 161:24 orders 132:16 251:11 89:2 93:2 101:9 259:16 200:24 203:25 209:6 225:17,20,23 223:25 ordinance 109:25 102:18 103:12 overnuch 22:8 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25					1 0	
orders 132:16 251:11 89:2 93:2 101:9 259:16 200:24 203:25 209:6 223:25 ordinance 109:25 102:18 103:12 overmuch 22:8 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25						
ordinance 109:25 102:18 103:12 overmuch 22:8 216:20 217:11 225:25 226:9,10,12 perceives 25:25			5	195:5 198:12	-	
				200:24 203:25		
				216:20 217:11		
	ordinarily 7:11 115:7	118:25 120:21	overnight 9:8 196:10		pass 77:22 136:15	percentage 12:7 39:16

Trevor McGowan

Page 16

	1				
perfectly 184:22	39:17 77:2 148:8	160:25	podium 1:5 168:15	possibility 24:20	235:18 248:17
perform 91:15,18	150:12 220:15	placement 20:6	189:20 190:1 196:1	30:16 90:20 100:17	254:4 270:19
performed 60:14	227:12 237:5 264:8	144:17,24	208:4	101:8 105:16 172:6	precision 185:13
perhaps 6:2 19:1,11	permitting 127:17	places 21:11 43:12	pointed 18:8 19:3,8	181:23,24 182:24	preclude 30:15 223:12
23:3 25:13,19 34:6	permutations 93:3	118:24	157:20	186:25 187:17,19	precluded 188:1
47:8 48:23,23,23	perplexed 179:4	placing 92:19	pointer 148:2	190:14,21 194:8	precursor 227:7
59:18 60:3 61:24	persistent 22:19	plain 121:5 129:19	pointing 203:2	197:13 205:20	predecessor 118:13
66:11 67:1 70:5	personal 84:25	plainly 41:12 60:1	points 20:22 68:20	230:3,5 268:1	predicated 37:2,4
72:13,24 75:9 76:6	perspective 5:12	63:20	70:3 71:18 127:25	possible 5:24 79:7	49:4
76:13 94:23 100:18	10:15 13:7 41:21	plan 220:17 223:16	179:3 188:1,19	80:23 81:1 90:12,16	predictability 169:23
113:8 115:17	67:6 80:20 89:14	267:4	210:17 228:23	90:22 93:3 116:15	189:16
117:13 120:1 134:5	90:5 91:13 92:9	planned 11:12 35:10	229:2 244:18	129:9 146:23 147:2	predictable 9:16
139:12 142:18	94:16,21 101:21	132:16	245:18 246:12,18	156:16 171:19	predicted 76:24
147:13 159:6	103:15 133:1	planners 222:8	251:14 253:6	174:25 175:1	predilection 160:17
166:16 168:2 190:8	137:18 151:4	planning 13:6,11 19:4	262:16	186:19 196:11	preempt 181:2,17
190:24 192:23	152:18 154:13	221:20 226:25	Polish 169:7	241:24 242:14	preempting 182:6
190.24 192.25	157:24	239:15 254:9	ponder 256:2	255:15 256:1 267:5	preemptively 228:3
204:8 208:16 211:8	persuaded 181:20	plans 35:25 225:17,20	poil 2:22 4:4 7:12,20	272:4	preference 134:15
	-	226:10	-		164:4 195:13
211:9,24 212:16	pertains 33:1 177:8		7:21 8:2,18 11:2	possibly 60:15 93:10	
213:5 214:15,21 226:15 245:16	178:15 179:8 186:4	planting 35:23	13:21,24 14:2,12	130:3 158:12	266:11
	perverse 34:6	plants 13:12 23:25	18:9 19:12 20:4,14 28:0 20 22:5 8 24:8	243:19 270:14	preferences 271:16
248:17 257:12,15	PETER 2:14 patita 176:25 182:20	25:21 53:23 63:15	28:9,20 33:5,8 34:8	post 179:7 Postal 160:8	preferred 7:15 63:21
257:21 260:10	petita 176:25 183:20	133:3,6,18 140:13	34:19 37:3 39:1,18	Postal 169:8	67:15 71:20 146:14
262:6 264:5 265:22	185:24 236:13,13	167:7,22 191:20	41:5,11 42:10,15,17	post-award 251:2,9	prefers 160:11,18
266:25 267:1,2	240:25 241:18	221:5,6,11,20 222:7	42:18 43:1 57:18	post-hearing 246:9	163:25
period 11:1 12:8,11,20	242:6 246:23 260:5	234:5,6,16 239:14	62:7 68:4,25 78:7	268:2,8,22,23 269:4	prejudice 235:4
13:1 39:15,24 40:1	260:7,11,18,19	259:13,19,20,24	78:18 81:4 82:10	269:8,17 270:2	preliminary 200:2
40:3,5,7,14,16,21	phase 1:7 1:4 6:6	plant's 57:6 131:11	85:17 86:16 87:1,14	potential 4:16 26:19	208:1,13 245:8,18
40:22,25 46:20	123:19 180:11	150:7 229:5 230:2	98:25 106:6,17,24	35:1 57:18 59:11	257:24 264:18
47:21 53:3 54:9,18	181:8 182:8 207:7	plant-specific 193:6	107:1,18 110:1,13	69:19 73:1 101:19	premise 68:5 104:4
55:10 62:21 63:1,3	222:10 234:21	203:12,14,19	111:9 120:12	172:11 176:21	113:12
63:18 64:20,20 66:8	235:6,8,12 239:5	205:17,18,22	121:10 126:1,18	181:4 197:18	premised 134:18
67:5,15,16,18 68:3	243:16 247:6	256:18	131:7,20,23 132:4,7	potentially 5:25 8:5	preoccupation 173:2
68:21 71:22 73:9,23	250:10 251:25	plate 243:13	138:11,12,14	29:25 33:9,23 48:13	prepared 196:9,9
74:17 75:19,22,24	252:21 253:1 270:4	platform 250:19,21	144:16 147:22	54:16 58:2,14 91:17	prescient 231:3
76:3,4,9 77:10,12	phased 191:17 192:7	play 11:10 45:25	148:4,7,14,23 149:8	127:11 144:22	prescriptive 247:7,25
77:17,18,19,20	192:17 193:9	216:15,23 218:17	151:23 153:13	185:23	presence 13:18 141:13
78:25 79:3,5,18,19	phases 235:4 251:20	233:8 235:8,11	155:3 157:2,6,16,22	PO3 270:19	165:10
80:14 81:1,5 83:11	PHILIPPA 2:10	playing 66:5	161:7,9,25 162:5,9	PO6 2:8 4:10 204:17	present 17:21 41:3
83:12,19,20 84:2,3	philosophy 3:19,21,23	PLA-0098 170:17	162:17,21,22	207:9 235:2,3 236:6	46:12 52:13 53:21
84:11,16,19 87:11	phrase 62:12 77:6	PLA-0108 169:15	163:12 164:14	238:21 239:1,2,7,22	67:13 73:13 94:20
87:12 88:18 92:7	136:1	PLA-2 120:4 122:11	165:5,18 166:23	practical 63:22 235:17	97:8 163:22 171:20 179:16 180:11
99:23,25 100:22	phrased 191:19	124:12 127:2	167:10,15	practice 45:15 113:23	
102:14,15 105:12	physical 27:9	PLA-3 23:8 51:22 67:22	pools 112:1 124:5	139:17 143:20	181:11 183:8
105:21,25 107:6	physically 34:15	pleading 270:3	131:22 Pool/Pondage 38:24	157:18 167:13	184:20 186:9 187:2
111:5 112:4 150:25	physics 52:11,11			169:7,24 170:7	222:21 248:11,12
230:8 234:8 257:10	pick 14:25 15:1 69:20	pleadings 222:11,12	pop 265:8 portion 6:22 31:5,20	179:2 183:16 185:6	250:19,21 251:25 266:5
259:11 267:14,22	69:25 85:4 98:4 112:5 106:6 201:12	236:22 238:21,21	•	187:23 199:5	
269:25 271:3	113:5 196:6 201:12	please 1:11 14:21	79:18	243:25 261:18	presentation 6:10
periods 9:22 40:18 46:19,22,23 47:2,6	207:11 208:13 210:23	32:19 72:15 168:15 196:1 204:12 206:6	pose 13:13 57:13	264:13 269:22	8:20 12:3 14:7,19
· · · · ·			posed 58:14 62:16	practices 243:10	19:4 31:23 34:2
49:15 63:4,5,5,9,11	picked 197:2 226:22	pleased 168:20	244:22 position 24:5 37:12	249:2,5,10,11 261:14 14 15 16 18	44:4 50:6 65:1 98:12 107:24 134:3
65:12 66:21 67:9	227:4 235:16	plentiful 5:7 10:22	-	261:14,14,15,16,18	98:12 107:24 134:3
69:8 127:15	picking 3:13 108:9	49:24 83:10 230:9	42:12 46:4 56:23	262:3,4,7 263:8,25	142:8 143:10
permanence 194:24	142:22 208:10	plenty 140:19	59:17 71:8 96:23,24	263:25 264:3,7,10 264:15	168:10 192:23
permanent 1:4 2:18 35:17 62:19 177:18	picks 67:1 picture 35:11 186:19	plots 89:1 plotted 82:22	97:3,4,14,25 99:7	264:15 Brook 170:24	253:20 254:8
	•		108:20 114:22	Preah 170:24	256:25 260:6 271:22
182:16 222:13	231:19	plotting 60:15 86:4 plus 74:12 245:2	117:17,18 139:25	preamble 37:22 38:5	
Permissibility 4:4	pieced 179:21	pius 74:12 245:2 pm 137:9 142:13,14	147:9 154:6 177:25	129:5	presentations 257:2
168:17 permissible 24:1	pitch 98:14,17	pm 137:9 142:13,14 142:15,17 166:8	182:21 185:23	preceding 170:23,25	261:12,17 266:4
-	place 13:13 30:17	· ·	186:20 232:3	190:11 247:1	271:19,23
51:23	32:24 38:13 62:22	168:16 190:2	235:25 238:22	precise 16:6 76:23	presented 26:18 94:18
permission 76:11	119:11 128:10	195:21,23 202:23	239:21 240:3 252:3	186:1 244:18	102:9 151:17
145:5 238:9	140:12 157:17	206:20 253:24	253:10 266:11	262:17	260:12 263:16
permit 21:7 151:4	160:5 167:18	272:11 DME 150:12 152:5	268:12	precisely 56:7 72:24	presenting 257:14
162:13 permits 26:13	216:19 229:14 235:23 237:12	PMF 150:13 152:5 156:10 157:14	positions 24:18 272:1 possibilities 26:1	169:25 171:2 185:6 189:7 197:8 213:10	267:15 presently 24:4 148:22
permits 26:13 permitted 17:23 24:10	placed 122:1 153:21	159:22	191:2,4	213:14 226:19	presently 24:4 148:22 presents 188:3
permitteu 17:25 24:10	piaceu 122:1 155:21	137.22	191.2,4	213.14 220:19	presents 100:5

.,	,	-			
preserve 33:22	183:11 201:13	88:12,18 89:14,16	179:17 181:25	135:3 156:5 157:25	245:12 267:5
President 188:10	proceed 1:11 3:6	91:14 92:6,8 95:7	192:2 199:3 229:21	186:23 201:2	quite 15:20 30:12
press 226:25 227:4	71:13 76:16 116:20	106:2 124:23	244:16 258:20	217:13 219:25	38:19 44:2 52:12
pressing 141:20	145:6 168:15	131:11 146:1	262:23 263:6	226:18 250:6 251:4	55:8 68:17 76:5
pressured 209:6	195:14 196:1	profile 28:13	provided 2:17 10:13	purposes 2:11 41:3	87:22 93:16 94:25
presumably 92:21	199:22,22,24	programme 187:20	11:11 21:23 22:12	43:14 46:12 51:19	109:14 127:24
165:13 168:6	204:12,20 260:14	progress 264:23	28:6 31:15 43:8	52:14 65:22 66:3	133:23 142:9 148:2
pretty 86:23 103:8	proceeding 25:22	271:19	47:12,24 48:4 50:23	67:13 74:3 95:24	150:16,24 155:7
134:2 214:4 255:22	118:1 171:7,20	progressed 225:3	77:10 79:9 105:6	144:21 156:19	166:22 167:24
prevail 172:14	180:14 191:8	progression 267:22	107:19 114:6 135:5	169:5 170:13 175:4	168:8 190:24
prevent 22:22 23:19	203:16,25 204:6	prohibit 23:11	136:22 139:10	175:23 177:2 215:4	194:20 201:13
29:15 123:19	239:4,23	prohibited 156:5,20	140:7 161:15 164:7	226:19 231:16,22	202:8,14 219:25
160:13 164:14	proceedings 173:17	prohibition 21:21	192:4 210:3 225:9	242:23,24 243:7	233:15 234:20
preventing 29:13	177:19 180:11	151:10 213:17	provides 7:4 30:12	247:10 248:24	257:10 259:22
prevents 149:7	181:11 183:8	prohibits 33:19	41:22 42:9 44:18	249:3,24 255:3	263:11
previous 11:23 38:22	185:25 186:17	project 18:12 19:17	47:19 49:12 111:20	purpose(s) 129:5	quoted 169:20
75:9 89:2 194:5,12	187:16,17 189:4	34:3 158:16 162:12	120:22,25 124:3	pursuant 1:1 128:11	quotes 255:25
previously 30:23	201:23 222:11	163:23 172:10	146:14 149:7 174:2	149:8	
102:9 111:1 142:6	228:6,13 238:6,7	227:20,25	176:10,16 184:5	push 34:8 188:9	<u> </u>
268:6	239:2 240:11,19	projects 223:1	191:8 192:11,19	pushing 25:16	Race 187:11
pre-feasibility 254:9	241:25 246:23	promise 20:24	197:4 212:20 230:4	put 1:13 15:17,25 18:6	radar 265:24
pre-hearing 3:24	247:6 248:11,12,14	prompt 74:25	providing 6:18 12:11	31:19 41:10 61:21	radically 181:10
143:4	251:5,20,25 252:6	prompted 75:12	12:18 13:3 80:1	70:17 76:6 77:13,21	Rae 2:14 3:14 12:1
price 9:10	252:14 264:5,6	prompting 64:11 prompts 43:3 79:11	95:12 112:3 121:11 175:5 184:24	79:6 84:12 87:4 88:14 92:3 98:5	31:23 71:7
prices 18:4 primary 23:9 136:9	proceeds 217:23 process 19:6,19 23:3	prompts 45:5 79:11 pronouncement	1/5:5 184:24 190:18 194:22	88:14 92:3 98:5 99:14 119:10	rails 237:24 238:1
195:4 219:3	41:18 46:21 80:2	180:23	224:19 225:5	125:18 127:12	rain 5:10 142:20
principal 43:25 146:9	86:2 110:17 112:24	propagate 61:12	229:17 249:24	129:18 131:21	rainfall 5:8
201:2	126:8 145:12 193:5	70:21	265:19 271:18	141:13 159:14	rains 5:21
principle 27:7 41:19	193:7,7,9,12 209:21	proper 3:2 20:19 24:6	provision 2:15,21,24	161:13 162:8 167:2	raise 45:1,19 101:18
69:22 117:9 176:25	209:21,22,22,23,24	111:12 140:1,3	17:24 30:16 32:17	167:6,9,18 168:2,25	163:12 196:22
178:23 181:6	209:24 235:1,21	175:23 192:10	36:6 39:6,12 42:24	177:11 180:21	251:13 254:1
186:21 213:8,9	254:9 256:13	243:5 257:3	45:21 46:2 62:21	186:21 207:15	raised 33:10 45:12
214:7,16 219:10,13	processes 18:14	properly 3:18 120:2	66:2,7 70:1 103:25	209:10 231:2 232:2	117:10 148:25 151:25 155:11
228:15	192:17	121:3 123:24	106:5 121:4 144:9	236:16 238:8	157:7 164:21 165:7
principled 41:19	produce 4:20,23 5:25	208:19 242:2	180:10 214:24	243:12 244:24	172:19 187:15
principles 14:14 17:18	8:3 47:1 49:1 51:2,5	propitious 72:19	224:22 247:12	245:13 264:2 266:1	205:2 245:9 265:25
17:20 19:7 59:7	52:24 53:11 59:19	proportion 216:16	provisions 3:2,16	269:22 270:8	raises 222:21
101:6,23 111:19	60:4 77:12 80:25	proposal 271:8,9	19:24 21:3 27:2	puts 166:25 177:15	raising 155:4 156:17
182:15 183:20	82:18 84:19 92:14	propose 3:5 140:17	65:11 66:12 67:2	putting 26:12 97:6	185:24
234:23	93:5 98:6,7 100:19	145:6 151:16	69:5 110:10 111:16	101:8 132:25 231:4	raison 46:2 136:7
prior 82:10 191:1	104:13,18 105:20	195:19 210:18	118:18 119:14,15	253:12	198:19 229:11
priorities 62:1	107:6 120:9 125:25	232:6	119:25 120:5 123:1	pyramid 3:10	Ramban 40:20,23
priority 67:4	131:6 134:19 136:4	proposed 46:14 47:12	129:10 159:16	P-0326 118:10	range 108:16 176:21
prise 217:17	268:20	48:16 109:9	183:9 185:1 189:10	P-0515 217:8	228:25 253:15,17
private 97:19,22	produced 1:23 6:2	proposition 117:16	216:11 217:10	P-16 117:8	rapt 208:5
227:22 258:9	48:13 52:21 54:8	propositions 201:9	230:19,20,23,24,25	P-302 9:6 52:18	rarely 94:20 146:22
probability 74:8	55:16 57:5 60:24	propriety 175:19	234:18 246:18	P-325 35:16	rate 8:4 19:14 48:16
probably 3:7 68:3	79:6,19,20 80:13	180:8 181:15 182:2	262:13	P-477 8:11	48:17,18 49:2,7
92:2 195:15 199:10	93:4 96:1 100:22	182:16 183:21	provoke 204:15	P-546 47:24 D 586 120:4	51:11 52:21 54:3,7
199:11 200:17	120:14,16 162:9	187:1 193:13	provokes 46:8	P-586 139:4	54:12,14,15,24
245:21 259:19,19 267:0	271:4	prospective 161:15 protected 23:22	préparatoires 22:11 209:1 220:2		55:15,24 58:1,17
267:9 probe 93:18	produces 7:5 59:20 61:16 88:3,24	174:18	public 222:14 235:21	<u>Q</u>	67:6 73:4,7,7 74:2
problem 6:5 43:5	107:13 118:20	protecting 24:20	235:24 238:5	Qatar 170:17	74:11 77:16,24,25
62:16 97:1 113:17	130:21	protecting 24:20 protection 164:2	pull 32:5 80:8 138:6	quality 190:19	78:23 79:4,16 80:16
113:19 158:6 162:6	producing 11:18,19	228:20	148:24 163:6	quantity 103:19	81:6,7,17,18,19,24
problematic 124:14	11:20 79:1 80:4,5,7	prove 147:1	271:24	121:14	82:2,5,6,12,14
149:20 153:17	83:11,19 111:4	provenance 218:7	pulling 110:15 145:9	quantum 56:10	83:18 84:15 85:6
154:10,16	125:24	provide 11:8 44:15	puning 110.15 145.9 pun 140:24	questioned 46:9	86:13,13 87:24 88:3
problems 116:1	product 50:10	61:19 66:14 71:8	pure 7:3	quick 26:9 27:18 132:23 137:17	88:12,16 89:5,9,12 89:15 92:15 93:8
157:19,23 160:15	production 4:16 6:16	106:6,20 110:20	purely 18:17 67:11	132:23 137:17 139:4,6 147:6	89:15 92:15 93:8 95:3 97:18 102:14
183:24 225:2	6:24 7:18 8:20 33:6	122:17 135:6,8	purported 55:25	193:20 254:15	102:18 103:23
procedural 4:15 67:11	53:2 54:4,7,12,15	136:14 138:3,20,21	purportedly 131:1	quicker 117:20	102:18 105:25
186:21 188:10,23	54:19,25 55:24	138:22 139:14,21	purporting 126:24	quickly 38:22 90:8	105:19 110:25
240:8 251:11	56:25 57:1,1 58:1	141:19 142:4 145:8	purpose 39:10 48:25	116:11,15 134:10	111:3 124:23
procedure 158:1	82:7 84:2,7,11	145:14 169:18	61:1 70:1 92:5	135:2,19 137:21,22	136:16
173:3,7 179:9	86:12,23 87:10,25	176:9 178:23	112:22 113:15	171:21 234:20	rated 7:8
				1,1121 25 1120	

rather 7:16 39:7 41:6	reason 36:6 58:15	recorded 48:18	255:23 266:12	119:9 123:9 124:12	repeat 82:16
	63:22 65:8 67:14	105:11		128:24 135:23	•
42:3 56:6,25 64:20			regarding 37:9 193:3		repeated 172:1
70:11 96:19 101:22	92:9 119:5 150:11	recourse 172:1	regardless 269:3	136:12 165:7	repeating 131:17
101:25 124:2,18	159:19 166:19	red 5:14 14:25 15:2	regards 126:13 171:9	194:16 207:22	replaced 150:15
126:8 137:4 159:3	172:18 203:2	16:11 149:25 156:1	227:12 240:3	217:5 219:10,13,18	reply 75:15
179:6,21 182:7	236:11 246:21	redesign 158:18	247:17	220:8 230:23	reports 226:25 227:4
198:6 200:12,13	263:5 264:1	redesigned 152:22	region 126:16 130:10	234:16 238:13,17	representation 32:24
202:15 228:3	reasonableness 106:3	redo 26:17	130:12 250:23	238:23 239:7	RÉPRESENTED
245:10 256:25	reasonably 48:19 60:5	reduce 7:17 51:15	regional 262:6	240:19,21 241:3	2:16
rational 18:1	178:23 197:14	62:7 80:2 121:15	Registrar 204:7,10	242:17,19 247:12	represents 33:24
rationale 175:12	272:3	157:8	Registry 90:17	254:17	53:10 56:10 57:14
			8.		
Ratle 105:5 167:14	reasoned 189:7	reduced 88:1 155:22	regrettably 174:21	reliable 173:24	57:15 109:17
235:10,14	244:14	157:9 166:24	regulate 160:21	reliably 16:2	Republic 1:16,18 2:2
Raymond 258:8 261:3	reasoning 169:11,17	171:17 179:24	regulated 164:6	reliance 117:23	2:16 168:22 194:17
re 4:15	170:9,25 171:2	reducing 92:7	regulates 20:2	relied 237:13 249:6	request 4:12 141:18
reach 3:10 74:24 83:8	184:7 186:10 194:5	reductions 35:22	regulating 65:21	relief 4:12 171:13	168:23 170:1
83:16,24 84:5 103:8	196:16 197:24	redundant 84:18	regulation 19:2,5,8,10	175:15 176:3,6,7,15	171:13,20 172:22
123:13 172:7	244:20	109:10 111:6	19:15,20 102:11	176:18,22 177:1	172:25 173:8
179:19 181:1 184:7	reasons 113:8 159:4	Rees-Evans 2:12 22:8	263:15	182:1 185:14 186:4	175:10,17 176:14
185:1,4 195:1 209:7	165:14 171:19	216:17 217:3,7	regulations 19:18	193:24 206:21	182:1,14,18 183:2
243:19	179:22 183:4 187:1	263:2	regulatory 152:14	236:16 243:3,6,9	206:21 228:8,9
reached 84:9 170:22	197:6,7 198:23	refer 37:10 55:13	228:2	248:17 249:22	236:8,16 242:7
191:16 237:15	200:11 210:2 220:5	72:16 124:9 246:4	reify 263:9	250:8 251:15	243:2,6,9 246:22
238:3	232:12 233:18	reference 16:14 65:12	rejected 154:3 173:13	260:14,18 261:2	248:17 252:19
reaches 23:12 24:21	236:14 252:2	67:3,4 122:4 146:9	rejecting 181:20	relies 61:22	254:14 260:13,13
28:17 89:10 126:18	recalculate 154:25	169:13,16 171:10	related 15:16 27:3	relieved 253:16	261:2
reaching 22:22	recall 2:7 12:3 17:17	194:7 199:23 207:8	53:11 95:21 171:14	rely 60:11 61:16 62:4	requested 131:14,15
reacting 255:17 272:1	29:10 50:6 62:17	227:17 243:22	237:3	62:6 126:24	174:3 181:13,17
reaction 100:5 101:9			relates 67:16 90:13		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	68:7 106:5,22	258:17 263:12,13		remain 10:11 51:18	184:14 185:9
101:19 102:1	107:25 127:19	264:25	256:4	164:24 173:23	requesting 176:5
133:12 159:13	135:20 149:4	referenced 202:3	relating 140:13	252:20 253:3	183:5
193:20	153:15 154:19,22	references 66:21 67:9	187:10 224:22	remainder 73:5 98:11	requests 185:6 187:25
reactions 100:3	163:18 170:15	170:5,7 259:6,7	226:11 234:15	remained 225:4	189:14 247:4
202:19 268:17	187:20 196:25	referencing 170:21	256:10	remaining 73:11	249:22 250:8,25
read 16:25 17:1,2,8,8	206:9,12 213:19	referred 11:16 12:2	relation 18:22,23	78:20,25 80:15	251:1,15
116:9 120:21 209:1	228:23 252:6 258:6	55:9 68:3 69:13	29:11 96:7 170:11	remains 17:25 114:14	require 17:23 59:1
231:12 247:13	262:12 270:18	96:3 177:20 198:18	171:1,2,20 174:14	164:25 175:8 178:7	60:25 62:24 83:16
readily 180:1	recalled 171:24	232:16	175:14	179:10 184:11	83:17 88:10 93:11
			relations 173:24 174:1		
reading 16:23 52:5	recalling 35:13	referring 15:10,12		217:2 235:20	112:20 113:4,7,16
111:12 209:3	recedes 110:8	65:5 97:15 124:15	180:4	remarkable 129:14	114:19 115:10
readings 27:2 69:19	receive 21:1 205:13	refers 21:18 25:2	relationship 88:15,16	remarks 72:24 111:11	149:19 157:15
reads 197:25 225:15	267:17 271:1	29:24 50:3 53:2	123:25 129:2	139:6 175:25 196:9	164:19 187:14
256:3	received 39:23 40:20	54:3,6,7 63:7 65:14	136:13 174:12	201:15 206:24	259:17,18
ready 1:11 168:15	136:15 198:20	66:17 69:5 124:18	233:1 243:7 248:23	254:2	requirement 109:12
196:1	receiving 270:25	170:20 230:22	250:1	remedial 176:23	109:20 127:6
real 125:22 217:4	recent 139:16 167:13	reflect 3:19 24:7	relative 14:10 68:16	183:18	requirements 10:7
237:10,10 239:19	177:13 199:19	100:23 102:3	74:9 152:2 157:9	remedy 179:10 188:22	106:25 107:2
269:8	recently 181:7	148:14 151:25	relatively 5:10 83:6,11	remember 8:19 12:1	130:22 131:2
realisations 73:13					
	reciprocal 221:25	157:7 265:4 266:17	83:14,22 110:13	103:20 149:16	140:15 167:2
74:25	Reclamation's 155:23	269:9	111:25 121:20,22	153:10 215:6	183:12 249:6 262:5
realise 36:1 116:13	recognise 85:25 88:25	reflected 9:2,25 11:21	121:23,24 133:5	remind 90:25 214:22	requires 17:21 46:13
147:11 257:19	250:11 257:9	19:22 23:18 81:12	153:14,22,24	reminded 162:15	60:1 65:17 66:13
realistic 108:10	recognised 8:10 11:14	125:21 173:3 219:1	155:10 190:8	254:7	67:7 69:20 74:24
reality 19:19 63:13,23	38:15	247:20	199:19 255:18	reminds 1:13 63:15	83:8,23 106:17
66:9 255:11	recognising 181:13	reflecting 19:8 33:5	release 8:17 9:9 35:6	remove 91:12 101:20	110:17 159:2
really 1:9 10:12 26:2	182:4 254:13	56:2,3 64:4 66:9	107:10 108:20	231:13	176:13 220:22
43:4 58:21 62:12	recognition 177:23	109:19 192:25	109:2	render 14:9 103:5	224:19 225:8
43:4 38:21 02:12 70:9 75:11 80:9	182:19		released 7:22 8:3		240:16
	recollection 199:11	reflection 193:19 reflections 192:13,20		176:17 183:1,6,13 184:3 238:16	requiring 60:12 86:20
87:23 97:6 103:2,15		,	78:19		1 0
104:20 133:23	recommends 233:25	193:17	releases 7:24 73:20	251:22	100:9 165:6 176:24
137:11 149:20,25	reconceived 237:8	reflective 97:21	74:13 132:9	rendered 60:12 61:1	270:24
151:18 159:8	reconcile 7:2	reflects 5:14 24:5	releasing 35:5 74:2	112:21 135:2 245:4	res 169:5,16,19 174:10
192:22 201:4 205:8	reconsider 59:16	48:18 49:6 89:11,23	82:11 87:13	rendering 185:11	181:6,19,24 182:25
208:13 209:4	record 24:13 38:13	92:17	relevance 239:1 269:2	186:4	197:21 198:1 203:7
250:25	46:13,18,23,24,25	refresher 27:18	relevant 3:17 13:1	renders 122:8	237:21 238:17
	48:14 72:15 95:11	regard 37:25 43:11	19:24 22:11 32:23	reopening 242:23	241:12
real-life 47·10			17.47 44.11 34.43	LODDING LTL.LJ	271.12
real-life 47:10 real-world 103:6		8	51.20 63.12 78.25	renackage 210.10	research 200.16
real-world 103:6	105:4,9,11 153:3	45:2,4 96:17 98:2	51:20 63:12 78:25	repackage 210:19	research 200:16
		5	51:20 63:12 78:25 108:16 114:14	repackage 210:19 reparation 176:8	research 200:16 reserve 251:24

reserved 34:23 235:25	122:8 139:1 164:3	185:8 195:6 219:1	137:7 143:8 161:4	sat 228:11	season 5:6,8,20 6:14
239:21 240:2	258:4 261:9 272:3	right-hand 16:22	169:3 170:6 207:23	satisfactory 20:11	6:16,19,23,23 10:20
reserving 252:3	restitution 177:5	rigorous 233:24	rounding 162:8	129:7 146:16 223:8	10:24 13:8,8 31:22
reservoir 6:13,13,21	restore 173:22	riparian 254:24	row 69:2	262:24	31:22 35:23 47:7
7:10 13:3 14:4	restrain 264:7	RIPPIN 2:13	rubber-stamp 248:3	satisfied 79:20	49:8,22,23 74:9
27:22 32:25 34:9,13	restrict 67:24 103:24	rise 73:12 148:11,21	rule 21:12 22:2,4 63:2	satisfy 120:6 262:4	75:4 76:21 109:22
37:3 40:2,20 68:5	restriction 69:21	rising 9:17	121:7 129:11	Saturday 9:22 10:4	132:13 234:7
77:15 78:8 79:3	restrictions 126:6	risk 25:25 186:6	176:11 178:6	40:7,8 267:2	seasonal 157:15,17
83:18,25 128:1	restricts 24:1 51:23	216:11 228:14,15	184:10 219:3,8,9,15	saw 11:22 27:17 89:2	234:6
148:11,18 150:2,5	rests 230:19,20	237:10	219:20	104:9	SEBASTIAN 2:20
153:11,22 154:8,15	result 8:1 49:6 54:15	risks 189:4	ruled 154:23	saying 43:14 76:18	second 3:16 5:23 7:2
154:18,20 156:4,16	61:5 62:1 78:22,24	river 4:18,19,22 5:3	rules 41:24 176:10	97:20 100:5.19	16:18 19:23 26:6
157:5,25 159:15	82:21 83:11,19 84:1	5:11 6:16,21 7:4,23	183:11 219:21	129:15 218:18	35:17 36:25 42:23
162:7,10,13,25	89:25 95:11 102:6	13:2 14:24 28:14	251:12	219:6 221:17 233:2	43:20 46:20 47:4,20
163:1,2 164:11,17	105:17 112:23	39:16,23,25 40:15	rule-exception 36:24	259:5 261:6	48:12,19 50:11,14
164:20 165:21	113:3 130:21	40:24 47:3 49:7	ruling 174:2,4	says 8:12 36:6 37:1	50:14 51:3,7 52:20
reservoirs 22:21 36:15	135:14 159:23	50:9,10 51:12 52:24	run 5:18 6:4 10:22	102:16 123:2	58:18 60:3 69:4
resistant 93:16 94:9	161:10,25 165:25	54:14 69:8 73:3,16	63:15,24 79:16	129:22 138:9	70:7 73:4,22 76:13
97:9	resulting 9:21 126:10	73:22 74:6,16,17,19	95:16 99:21,25	153:18 160:6,12	78:5,6,12,16,21,21
resolution 67:10	136:17 151:23	74:23 75:4 76:22,23	145:22 163:16	166:23 198:16	78:23 81:20,24
117:21 177:7,10	150:17 151:25	77:3,10 78:5,22	195:17 210:22	212:22 213:22	82:12,14 86:4 89:6
180:18 188:25	results 69:10 82:5	80:15,18 82:24,25	runners 156:18	212:22 213:22 214:7 225:16	94:14 101:14
189:3,17 248:7	86:25 87:13,16	83:3,5,8,13,15,21	running 7:16 40:7	234:24 237:13	105:12,14 110:22
resolve 185:2 203:14	88:11 108:12,23	83:23 88:10 94:21	68:12 73:16 74:20	238:2 263:16	112:2 115:25 116:4
204:7.10 221:23	112:12,20 118:21	95:14 100:8 101:12	92:23 95:23 99:16	scale 16:22 35:25	125:2,5 128:25
resolved 33:25 250:13	131:3,5 152:9	104:3 120:15	100:9 163:19	214:4 261:19	132:3,5 136:12
resolving 59:4	resume 195:20	122:15,19 123:4	171:24	scenario 7:16 49:5	144:17 145:10,13
resort 170:10.21	retain 6:14 40:15,23	136:4 224:4 229:5,9	runs 41:2	64:7 101:16	145:15 148:6 155:2
resources 2:4 37:23	165:13	229:13 232:22	run-of-river 2:18 3:4	schedule 39:20 40:10	155:9 161:24 169:3
245:22	retaining 23:19	233:1,10	3:13 4:15,17,24	40:13 41:1 90:1	170:6 172:17
respect 2:10 22:2 25:8	return 24:4 32:24	rivers 3:4,22 4:24 5:1	6:25 7:3 10:17,20	92:2,17 110:11	175:13 177:8
47:12,25 48:25	42:7 58:10 150:25	21:2,7,25 22:4,18	13:5 23:25 28:25	126:22 128:5	178:21 181:2 183:6
69:17 103:2 106:22	174:14 223:23	23:11,13,16,20,21	56:13 63:13,23 66:9	135:11 139:1,3	184:1 190:14
107:17,20 118:6	264:17	24:19,21 25:2,10	68:24 133:16	141:7 161:16,21	191:15 192:16
120:10 122:16	returning 11:3 26:24	27:4 34:22 35:11	146:17 221:11	268:6	196:15 206:16
124:5 132:15	62:16 103:17 130:6	36:2 38:9,10,11	222:23,25 223:1,13	scheduled 266:5	207:6,23 208:13
193:22 234:5	216:20	39:19 58:7 69:18	223:16 233:12	schedules 67:20	223:23 230:11
238:17 240:7,15	reveal 163:21	71:16,19 104:22	234:4 258:17	scheduling 251:19	235:8 256:4,7
248:9 249:14	revealing 87:22	109:19 111:22,24	rupture 199:17	scheme 36:1 111:15	263:11 265:1 268:4
251:24 252:22	reversed 5:9 118:12	119:23 121:19	Russia 181:9,12,15	129:2	secondary 49:11,14
264:24 271:10,11	reversing 89:8	122:25 129:8,25	Russia 101.9,12,13	Schofield 2:19 267:1	49:19,21,24 74:12
respectable 86:23	revert 109:13	133:25 136:11	S	271:15	127:13 134:19
respectably 49:1	review 210:18 246:15	165:17 166:2		scope 169:5 173:11	195:4 230:3,6,6,10
respected 129:11	revisit 3:11	211:19 215:8,19,20	Sackett 265:6	174:11 178:16	Secondly 33:15
respectfully 189:13	Revolution 199:16	215:24 218:16	sacrifices 159:9	179:1,5,7 180:17	seconds 82:5
217:16 247:4	rewriting 42:4	221:5,21 223:8	sadly 272:9	182:11 201:10	second-by-second
Respecting 125:14	RHEP 105:8 239:11	225:22 254:21	safe 70:22 147:7	203:9 205:14,23	58:20 62:18
respective 24:18	239:13 243:17,20	river's 8:5 61:3	149:18 154:8	239:8 244:12	second-last 137:14
179:25 203:8 219:1	rhythms 64:1	robust 61:9 190:16	160:24	249:12	Secretariat 272:7
respectively 161:5	Rica 170:19	robustly 189:6	safely 67:12	scratching 255:9	Secretary 2:7,8,19
respond 191:2 193:15	right 10:1 12:16 16:19	rocks 211:13	sake 18:17 Salal 7:7 167:7,9,10	screen 207:15 213:20	245:21
267:8 270:21	17:10 26:23 28:15	role 3:12 11:10,11		232:2 245:14,17	section 124:11 127:2,2
respondent 141:5	32:2 41:7 62:12	19:2 24:25 45:24	167:23	265:24	198:14
180:14 201:18	71:13 85:7 89:4	66:6 77:9 121:4	same 9:17 10:2,11	screens 90:17,18,19	secure 180:3
respondent's 181:21	96:24 97:6 115:10	216:15,23	12:21 15:13 20:5	scribbled 206:23	sediment 17:25 18:13
responds 177:1	119:22 123:13	room 141:9 193:19	32:9 39:1,21 40:1,5	scribbling 26:23	18:13 33:18,19,23
response 3:24 41:16	129:24 133:14,25	216:24 217:12	40:17,21 51:18 64:4	scripted 196:10	150:19,23 151:3,12
142:3 143:4 169:2	136:18 139:22	229:15	77:17 79:4 84:16	scrutiny 246:14	155:16 156:8,13,18
218:8 220:21	150:10 159:122	rooted 111:16 135:5	88:9 89:20 91:16	se 223:25	157:8,23,24 158:2,4
221:22 226:15	163:19 164:17,24	138:3	92:5 94:19 101:16	sea 147:19,21 148:13	158:6,9 160:14,19
254:16,16 255:13	166:22 167:24	roots 250:21	103:13 120:22	153:9,25 154:4,12	164:2 165:12,14
255:14 257:24	196:14 211:18,20	Rosalyn 188:11	130:12 136:16	155:6 161:5 163:7,8	227:12
264:18	211:21 212:4,5,9	rough 106:13 151:19	138:15 143:25	163:10,11 200:8	sedimentation 255:1
responses 202:19	213:1 215:11	roughly 64:4 157:5	152:24 159:23	seal 148:22 149:2	sediments 165:22
responsibility 181:4	217:24,24 219:3	162:1	164:11 166:4	155:13	seduced 211:25
222:3	228:20 242:25	round 26:6 68:19	167:17 174:3 187:9	SEAN 1:10	see 1:5 5:6,13,19 8:8
responsive 1:16 148:3	rights 25:9 170:14	76:13 109:22	187:16 221:6 224:4 254:12	search 80:10	8:11 9:7 11:16
rest 7:20 61:18 80:13	179:25 180:23	115:25 116:4 134:4	254:13 sample 9:4	searches 268:25	12:16,17,22 26:4
			sample 9.4		
1	1	1		1	

Trevor McGowan

Page 20

					• •
33:2 37:16 42:11,22	45:15 49:9 122:2	246:16 258:16	216:12	site 6:11 7:14 8:21	softened 138:4
45:15 48:3 50:22	123:22 191:8,17	settlement 172:2,14	signalled 190:21	10:19 12:4 15:4,5,8	software 151:18
56:9 63:14 66:20	212:16 213:15	177:3 189:13	signalling 191:3	18:8,10,21,21 19:2	solar 30:8
71:4 76:2 80:8	236:12 254:5	217:15,17 222:4	signature 245:20	24:3 44:20 46:14	sole 62:5
82:22 86:7,8 87:22	255:20 267:2,6,22	242:12	252:23	48:16 50:7 52:1	solely 59:23 61:16
89:4 93:7,23 98:5	269:11 271:18	seven 10:13 39:24	signatures 209:10	59:24 73:17 105:4	112:14 232:22
99:4 101:25 105:10	sensible 93:25 195:16	63:16 64:3 66:8	252:24	105:10,20 110:18	240:25
105:23 107:20	sensitive 38:2 61:8	67:8 69:2	signed 217:12	132:3 148:6 150:16	solid 188:7
109:24 110:16	112:25 135:3	seven-daily 69:8	significance 30:22	151:11 158:10	solution 151:9 179:16
112:11 113:9,10	sent 142:20	seven-day 39:15,20	45:10 55:11 190:20	159:2,2 162:15	187:7
117:9,14 118:23	sentence 43:20 56:16	40:1,3,5,7 64:14,20	significant 7:6 13:13	163:3,22 220:18,24	solutions 6:7,8 172:7
119:13 120:3	75:11 196:13,13	70:9,13 71:5	15:3 24:16 25:24	223:24 224:8,13	228:2
121:20 122:10	200:14 254:12,13	several 55:5 116:19	31:1 37:25 106:14	226:25 254:7 255:2	some 1:18 3:13 14:20
123:1,12 127:1,21	261:9	153:17 179:14	106:20 222:21,23	264:10	20:22 23:3 27:16,17
134:11 140:13	sentences 244:9	shadows 201:6	254:23	sites 223:25 224:4	32:13 45:2 48:22
142:21 147:15	separate 36:13 71:10	Shah 2:4 34:4 135:7	significantly 5:11	site's 105:13	49:4,25 71:9 74:17
148:1 151:22	186:15	shalt 150:9 214:6	66:11 113:3 127:16	siting 226:2,5,16,20	92:17 93:17 98:23
153:16 155:10	separately 32:15	shame 38:7	179:24	sitting 57:18 154:11	100:4,24 102:23
156:25 165:12	September 22:14	shape 92:13 141:1	sill 155:15 156:7	154:17 208:5	104:15 107:9
187:12 189:23	235:24 268:21	213:16	similar 10:3 62:6	229:24	113:16 116:12
191:10 194:3,13	270:16 271:2	shaped 223:20	132:14 171:23	situate 34:11 157:20	118:25 137:3,5
204:7 219:7 221:19	sequence 206:5 256:6	share 252:8,12 254:22	191:24	situated 2:24 4:18	142:2 147:2 148:1
227:1 232:22	256:8	sharp 22:19	Similarly 170:21	14:10 111:18	150:17 151:18
233:20 246:3	sequenced 205:24	sharpen 103:3	simple 81:12 89:18	situation 5:8,13 27:1	152:17 154:24
253:19 255:12	sequential 243:24	sharply 211:11	98:23 99:18 103:16	61:11 93:1 95:11,13	156:11 158:3
263:2 266:16 268:8	sequentially 147:12	sheer 157:4	187:6 230:16	108:19 114:22	160:14 163:17
seeing 15:16 82:23	249:18	sheet 103:14	simpler 69:10 98:21	132:16 133:22	167:7,19 191:22
142:12 272:5	seriatim 201:9	shelf 200:8 221:19	230:15	177:24 182:19	193:10 199:2,18
seek 57:2	series 27:20 47:2 59:5	shift 15:3	simplest 98:18 99:5,10	204:7,11	200:4,22 204:24
seeking 182:3,7	101:12 126:7 128:8	shine 211:12	100:15	six 59:5 115:11 135:16	205:5 206:18 207:4
seeks 57:3	131:3 138:25	shining 211:10	simply 6:3 7:4 19:18	194:21 225:10	207:6,21 209:1,17
seem 94:22 103:18 107:25 133:4	190:10 192:1	shoehorn 41:25 shoehorned 123:18	67:23 68:4 77:2 88:16 139:25	228:11 245:1,2,2 Sixth 188:12	209:18 210:17,23
139:13 167:18	199:12,24 200:2 201:9	short 23:6 40:2 72:7	188:15 195:18	size 10:5 13:21 14:2	210:25 211:11 212:16 213:15
202:8 256:12	seriously 36:8	130:20 158:14	196:4 201:8 215:10	20:13 34:7 42:10	222:1,2,24 228:14
259:25	seriousness 20:15	188:16 195:22	223:20 246:5	62:7 121:10 144:15	231:13 232:3 233:5
seemed 203:10 222:18	serve 13:18 186:10	198:22 200:25	258:15 263:15	157:4 162:10,13,13	233:13 235:15
231:3 256:14 257:2	189:11	201:8,9 234:17	270:3	162:16 163:2,16	236:12 237:12,12
257:6 260:4	serves 232:16	244:9 266:15	simulation 26:18	skewed 178:18	241:4,5,19,20
seems 15:20,23 64:13	service 12:23 169:8	shorter 13:10 84:1	since 140:18 167:18	skilled 152:13	243:15 244:7
70:10 91:15 93:24	243:10	107:6	171:25 188:17	skimming 155:17	247:14 251:14
120:19,24 121:11	serviceable 177:10	shortly 4:9 60:7	225:2	skip 86:19	258:2 259:4 262:20
128:15 129:15	services 264:3	238:25	sine 272:12	sleeping 9:18 10:10	265:21,24 268:8,16
130:4 139:7,9 190:4	serv[es 117:20	short-form 196:20	single 39:14 48:18	slice 12:24 17:4	268:17 272:8
193:8 205:12,20	set 2:8 4:9 15:7 21:18	197:14 198:3,12	56:16 103:14	slides 14:20 90:8,18	somebody 93:5
233:24 234:3	21:19,21 27:13,20	short-term 8:13 65:6	130:15,15 171:17	137:13,14	somehow 41:25 42:18
257:21 259:10,11	30:12 36:2 39:21	72:25	199:21 261:25	slightly 2:3 42:5 46:3	100:8 191:1 201:7
262:14	42:18 47:17 59:8	show 56:5	sir 2:9 4:10,13 1:6,8	128:19 148:7	201:20 232:18
seen 9:25 30:5 32:12	81:15 95:4 106:4	showing 12:5,7,9	1:12,23 2:24 43:22	161:19 210:12	someone 258:7
32:14 52:22 63:7,14	123:20 126:9,22	122:6	44:6 62:14 72:17	220:25	something 5:12 11:5,7
117:13 187:2	128:5,21 144:8	shown 34:10 65:3	75:7 85:9 90:16,25	slot 13:16	41:15 52:4 71:5
191:25 233:21	164:6 169:17	111:1 172:12	96:3,18 115:17	Slovenia 194:18 195:6	91:22 94:3,6 96:11
235:20 262:1	173:19 192:14,16	264:21	116:6 139:5 140:16	slower 76:13 83:18	96:18 97:18 113:23
sees 107:1	198:14,16 203:17	shows 10:12 24:24	140:22 141:25	sluicing 150:22,24	115:9 131:25
seised 204:17 240:23	222:15 233:21	31:18 64:2 88:14	143:11 167:21	152:6 156:9 157:13	146:25 159:8
242:3 252:20	240:8 242:18 247:5	89:19 165:15 172:5	171:15,24 189:20	157:17,24	166:12 178:19
select 27:8 186:12	251:1,15 268:6	174:3 200:14	192:24 193:21,25	small 16:20 46:17 83:5	198:12,15 204:22
selected 27:20 47:5	sets 22:1 39:11 40:6	shrink 148:9	195:11,15,25 196:2	85:1 103:19 110:14	206:5 216:18 218:5
107:5	41:1 42:7 103:12	shrinks 148:10	196:4 202:25 204:2	121:22 124:6 133:5	222:18 223:3
selecting 68:21 187:6	107:17 109:25	shut 7:17	204:11,13 206:2,22	146:22 153:14	236:19 244:3 257:1
selection 16:11 18:1	118:25 121:9	side 11:25,25 17:13	253:13,16 254:15	156:15 157:21	263:9 265:1 268:3
32:11 self-evident 59:8	144:15 181:5 182:6 setting 123:17 135:9	37:20 201:18 208:4	255:16,24 256:22 257:24 259:5 260:9	158:13 167:21 214:24 223:25	268:11,13 269:13 270:20,23
	8	213:3 215:20,25			
self-evidently 14:8	135:11 176:15	216:1 218:17	262:10 264:20	264:23	sometimes 63:4 74:18
22:3 59:18 74:21 self-standing 212:25	179:20 202:10 242:24	252:11 sides 35:15	265:12 266:7,14 267:24 268:16	smaller 33:21 151:23 157:2	74:19 76:2 200:21 200:22,22
senior 2:21 245:23	settle 188:4	sight 212:18 213:4,5	270:17 272:6	snow 5:7	somewhat 81:11 83:13
sense 31:8,14 43:25	settled 181:22 215:16	214:25 215:10	sit 229:23	Society 124:19	164:1 191:24 254:3

somewhere 12:15 84:4	151:5 152:4 154:11	statutory 186:25	217:6 218:13,22	102:18 110:24	surprised 109:7
158:15 220:25	154:14 156:1,5,7	stay 204:8 205:22	261:13	122:21	surrounding 3:2
229:15	157:11 159:20,24	stays 164:8	structure 36:24	succinct 189:9	172:9 259:24
sorry 1:12 36:11 53:8	160:18 164:9,10,13	steering 211:14	164:11 214:11	sucked 266:19	survey 163:20
55:4 84:22 107:23	164:16,24 165:11	stem 172:11	structured 205:20	sudden 270:8	susceptible 154:9
113:5 115:5 137:11	165:22	stemming 175:1 179:5	structures 160:25	suddenly 35:5 113:14	suspect 61:23 213:2
153:8,23	spillways 14:7 20:7	194:25	struggled 233:17	suffice 24:4 170:15	216:9 263:1,4
sort 3:9 17:4 37:10	34:12 35:6 40:4	step 20:16 111:22	studies 254:9,10	187:20 188:17	suspicion 109:20
47:18 68:11 92:1,2	144:24 146:24	256:7,13,16	stuff 56:18	sufficiency 59:6 67:16	suspicious 25:10
92:16 93:6 98:18	158:25 159:3,11	STEPHEN 2:11	subject 2:8 3:8 7:14	68:7 69:12 112:8	149:23
100:20 101:25	160:16	stepping 51:7	22:4 23:1 31:12	134:20	sustainable 151:3
114:21 183:15	spirit 111:15	steps 128:20 243:24	38:11 71:2 107:2	sufficient 29:19 30:11	sustained 53:5
263:2 268:8	split 162:24 163:4	still 5:25 7:6 13:6,7,9	130:23 143:1 144:3	30:13,19 37:14	sweep 201:12
sorts 100:13 220:20	spoke 220:11,11	13:15,17 57:10,22	144:8,13 152:21	42:20 73:18 74:11	switched 91:15
sought 176:16	256:24 257:2	75:22 79:17 104:24	172:22 173:4	77:14,22 80:11,21	sword 229:24
sound 20:10 70:22	260:10	105:19 112:3 154:2	179:10 180:12		SYED 2:4
				83:3 100:19 109:1,5	
186:21 220:21,22	spoken 245:21	154:16 163:24	207:1 212:13	121:1,13 122:4,14	synthetic 91:17
223:8,12 227:18	sports 272:9	164:3,21 206:10	213:17 214:6 215:8	156:9,18 188:21	system 8:23 10:2,15
262:23 263:8	spotlight 211:12	268:5	262:22 263:5	261:17 262:4	11:11,11 12:6 13:6
264:16	spurious 61:10	stop 27:15 88:20	submission 22:6 26:25	sufficiently 246:13	13:12,17 14:24
sounds 47:8 204:5	squarely 182:11	122:7	27:6 37:6 46:1 57:9	suggest 139:9 174:7	18:21,22 30:6 31:4
source 172:3 195:3	stable 180:3	stopping 215:24	59:14 66:2 69:15	suggesting 128:16	31:6,19 56:15 57:17
sources 243:25	staccato 196:13 244:8	storage/dead 162:24	70:19 71:21 77:6	suggestion 201:16	94:13,22 95:4,17,23
sovereign 170:14	stage 32:1 255:5	163:4	87:23 111:12	suggests 4:16 24:14	106:16 114:8 129:8
space 29:8 153:14	stages 207:25 254:8	store 8:17 9:8 11:1	117:23 119:20	suit 62:1 195:18	130:23
179:22 257:8	stand 165:4 225:1	21:24 35:19 39:17	129:1,13 134:13,21	suitable 151:11	systematic 175:2
spaces 170:12	246:14	41:7 68:24 73:1	135:15,25 165:15	SULJUK 2:6	systemic 182:10
sparse 66:22	standard 50:7 113:23	77:19 78:17 83:9,17	175:9 215:23 268:9	summarised 171:21	191:22 201:19
speak 15:21 57:20	165:16 256:3	86:15 89:24 91:24	268:22,23 270:2,14	summarising 111:11	209:25 235:5,11
71:7 76:14 266:12	263:15	107:5,15 109:1	submissions 3:1 4:4	summary 127:25	237:11 239:5,9
speakers 267:18	standards 147:8	233:2	1:18 2:1 19:24 23:1	134:10 145:8 160:2	241:1 250:9 253:1
-				243:24	
speaking 53:24 59:25	160:24 221:13,18	stored 7:19,21 8:6	26:6 103:17 125:7		system's 8:23
104:11 119:6 150:3	223:21 263:12,13	29:12 33:4 35:3	127:6 137:7 143:7	summer 5:20 10:8	
192:25	263:21,24	53:9 78:18 82:11	145:10 166:7	49:23	T
speaks 63:11	standing 206:12	86:16,17,25 87:2,14	168:17 169:3 176:2	summit 3:10	table 26:14 37:15,20
special 44:9,10 119:11	226:19	87:16,18 88:5 94:5	186:23 189:21	Sunday 9:23 10:4	86:4,6 87:22 88:14
124:17 177:4	standpoint 58:15	105:21 124:7	198:10 201:4 206:9	267:3 272:9	89:2 199:4
178:17 232:19	100:15	231:16,22	207:2,12,14,18	sunk 228:5,10,12,21	tackled 6:5
262:18 263:20	Stanford 258:7	stores 6:22 64:5	208:11,25 211:5	supplement 6:15	take 11:24 20:17
species 92:17 93:1,17	stanza 42:14	storing 63:24 80:4	213:12 221:10	122:19	26:16 27:13 42:16
specific 16:8 26:21	start 20:18 34:2 42:13	87:12 88:20 94:8	222:16 232:14	supplemental 73:25	45:9 52:11 55:11
37:4 119:3 159:4	42:13 88:20 119:4	110:10 222:24	236:1,10,10,14	183:11 251:12	62:22 64:22,22 70:4
169:20 174:11	160:2 241:8 265:18	straightforward 50:5	243:18 245:14,19	supplementary	70:16 71:14 72:4
176:9 178:13 186:7	started 52:12 72:10	60:18,19 61:9 68:11	246:2,4,4,6,8,9,11	219:21	78:16 83:9 85:19,20
specifically 4:1 76:7	232:4	70:20 103:9 134:23	246:13 247:1,14,21	supplementing 7:23	85:24 93:19 99:10
96:5 119:16	starting 62:20 100:20	134:24 136:25	253:5 263:4 268:2	73:2 74:1	
specified 54:8 79:24	119:20,21 122:11	177:12	269:4,8,17	supply 6:24 30:9	101:10,13 106:9
127:17 241:11	124:14 147:14	straitjacket 201:7	submit 170:5 171:6	92:10 170:11	115:13 116:3
specifies 120:5,11	211:17,19,21	strange 94:22	240:5	226:11	128:10 132:6 133:7
specify 218:22	starts 63:22 119:15	strengthen 222:19	submitted 174:8 186:8		135:18 136:6
1 0	133:23,24	237:1	194:10	suppose 92:16 99:11	141:13 142:25
spectrum 202:1	,			116:7 119:7 140:1	157:17 162:21,23
speculating 230:15	state 85:3	stress 170:6	subparagraphs 20:9	166:18 167:7	166:13 171:11
speculation 37:9,10	statement 117:13	stressed 115:21	subsequent 249:17	191:13 271:8	187:14 193:16
37:14	128:25 129:14	122:12 152:12	subsist 195:7	Supreme 210:11	195:16 201:6
speculative 36:19	171:17 176:14	178:4 184:9 187:3	substance 115:18	surcharge 29:2,6 33:2	202:20 205:5
216:21 218:2,10	179:22 185:7 244:9	195:5	171:15 183:19	110:5 149:13 158:4	221:17 223:19
speech 189:19 193:23	250:18 255:25	stretch 155:1 195:25	194:1 207:5 210:17	sure 38:1 48:6 91:21	230:5 231:1,18
speed 100:1	statements 170:22	224:4	210:19 246:2	99:9 102:8 103:11	244:25 245:1
speedily 245:5	222:14 255:22	stretches 170:7	substantial 35:18	115:14 152:15	255:14 260:2 269:2
spell 173:10	states 108:16 195:8	stretching 181:6	48:13 134:3	198:20 236:15	taken 2:11 8:9 10:15
spend 74:20 192:22	199:17 209:13	strict 37:16 173:4	substantially 34:18	263:22 265:23	19:5,9 36:8 41:17
221:1	265:5	179:10	54:15	surface 150:15,17,21	50:23 52:10,16 68:1
spends 111:4	state-of-the-art	strictly 23:13 58:6	substantive 188:20	152:3 157:11	
spent 234:17	227:14	strikes 98:21 191:24	199:25 210:16	surface-gated 149:5	102:25 103:3 117:4
spillway 29:13 144:23	stating 42:25	257:12	253:4 269:3	surface-level 146:12	137:3 140:12
146:25 147:1,3,3	statistical 102:22	strong 59:15 105:16	subversive 165:16	152:1 155:14	161:20 185:22
140.23 147.1,3,3			sub-MMD 77:9 80:22	164:13	208:6 220:6 249:15
140.3 5 21 24	etatue 251.5				
149:3,5,21,24	status 251:5 Statuta 176:12	178:24 struck 203:23 213:12			takes 7:4 16:10 25:18
149:3,5,21,24 150:12,15,17,18,21	status 251:5 Statute 176:12	struck 203:23 213:12	81:1 84:12,14 86:5	surmise 257:20	25:19 44:2 46:2

119:2 172:17 205:1	45:14 97:12 124:17	theory 125:4,18	84:14 87:5 90:8	157:22	257:20 264:6
206:23 235:23	213:16,23	thereabouts 72:14	102:13 110:24	topic 210:16	Tuesday 126:14
taking 26:18 67:24	termed 7:25	therefrom 51:18	116:5,12 128:3,4,14	topics 267:18	207:19 225:1 253:9
97:16 104:9 195:12	terminated 184:20	178:2 182:23	132:11 136:15	topography 162:12	253:9 259:2 262:14
242:3 264:9 268:3	terminology 45:10	213:24	137:3 139:7 141:19	228:1	262:15 266:5,22
talk 14:23 68:12 75:23	terms 10:16 22:24	thereof 4:21 264:4	145:22 148:20	total 14:23 17:9 99:13	268:12
100:21 197:5	30:24 33:20 36:21	thing 16:14,14 31:4	158:9,10 189:6	108:22 128:9 162:6	tunnel 148:20 158:13
215:14 228:16 261:11	39:14,15,20 40:9	85:1 103:14 113:15 115:4 139:13 150:4	193:12 201:3 203:4 206:1 207:14 208:8	totally 56:17 touch 241:5	158:14
talked 155:17	42:16 43:23 45:21 54:19 66:7,8 72:24	152:19 157:5	200:1 207:14 208:8	touched 224:3 227:9	tunnelling 220:10 227:14
talking 14:23 25:24	91:25 100:15 103:6	159:14 161:8 202:2	215:23 219:9	268:1	turbine 30:1 50:16
30:24,25 31:24	106:2 131:21	205:12 206:7	221:10,10 241:16	touches 171:14	78:19 120:8 121:2
54:20,21 100:7,21	159:18 160:11	208:23 263:18	242:9 244:15	touchstone 136:1	121:14 122:4 123:3
101:17 191:18,18	164:19 165:8	267:7 268:1	246:17 247:14	toward 257:6	123:14,17 125:12
202:14 208:25	177:12 190:18	things 16:4 32:21 33:9	249:17 256:5	towards 71:18 260:5	227:15
215:1 231:25,25	193:25 205:24	45:1 137:21 220:21	262:13,19 266:25	track 242:25	turbines 4:21 7:22
talks 202:11	206:14 212:2 220:3	241:17 251:16	throughout 3:9 5:1	tradition 143:13	29:22 40:4 51:1,5
tall 153:15 158:14	233:17 235:17	256:9 266:22	10:6 12:20 16:4	traditional 97:16	52:23 53:1 55:15,20
taller 18:10	246:2,12 247:7,20	270:11	22:20 30:9 48:20	197:23	65:24 73:4 77:16,23
TANWEER 2:7 Tanzi 2:11 4:6,9	248:1 261:3 262:18 262:20 264:13	thinking 96:25 191:4 191:15 192:16	49:18 56:12 75:3 76:21 86:9 125:20	tranches 270:18 271:9 transboundary	78:10 79:4 81:6 82:11 84:15 87:5
168:14,19 189:23	265:2	203:3,4,7,22 204:15	152:12 222:16	261:25	82:11 84:15 87:5 99:17,25 102:13
193:18 196:3,7	terribly 209:18	206:11 226:20	271:23	transcript 1:23 244:1	110:24 128:4,15
199:2 236:11	territorial 170:11,16	270:15 271:8	throws 238:1	266:18 270:10	136:16 220:13
244:11	territory 218:18	thinks 132:20 244:13	thrust 163:18	translate 17:12	221:3
Tanzi's 168:11 201:4	test 137:4 174:5	third 3:23 7:9 37:8	Thursday 126:14	transmittal 268:22	turn 4:12 7:10 18:14
207:12	230:24	42:11 60:24 69:10	tick 196:18	transpires 151:2	19:23 43:3 58:12,20
taps 132:12	testament 172:10	74:3 111:7 112:8	tie 4:8 217:10,14	trap 33:18,21	62:17 87:13 118:17
TARAR 2:6	testing 115:23 258:16	136:14 144:23	tied 4:14,17 121:5	trash 148:24	132:12 145:19
Tarbela 6:21	text 2:20 3:1,1 8:10	155:19 175:17	tight 212:13,24 215:8	travaux 22:10,12	147:10 155:14
target 69:3 targeted 189:7	192:21 193:8,11 208:21 209:8,9,11	179:8 186:3 190:21 196:17 207:10	tightly 214:20 217:11 217:14	209:1,3 217:2 220:2 263:1	166:1 180:14,19 207:6 210:16 219:5
TARIQ 2:12	208.21 209.8,9,11 209:12	256:24	timeframe 96:9	treaties 194:12	207.0 210.10 219.5
task 106:4 207:7	textbook 96:3	third-party 172:1	timely 225:5	Treaty's 3:20 24:14	241:7 253:19
217:15,16 218:19	thank 1:23 17:15 26:4	thou 150:9 214:6	times 7:22 55:5 73:5	42:8 58:5 59:6 60:6	255:19 256:4
218:21 219:19	26:22 32:7,22 39:4	though 122:9 125:3	74:10 85:16 87:17	60:10 81:14 129:17	turned 56:16
234:21,24 250:11	46:5 48:6,8 53:15	162:6 186:23	87:17 108:3,4 162:9	173:1	turning 82:11 145:18
taste 35:7 84:25	53:17 54:2 55:21	253:18 256:12	163:2 240:2	Treaty-compliant	187:22 197:11
team 141:3 150:4	62:15 65:2 71:12	269:18	time-variant 9:1	151:15 156:24	turns 99:4 124:24
264:21 271:22 Tear 228:18	72:2,5,17,19 75:8	thought 14:18 91:7 117:7 133:7 159:7	timing 243:14 248:18 255:7 267:12	223:22 224:9 Treaty-defined 126:2	tweak 128:19
technical 2:13,14 51:8	76:15 85:21 94:11 95:20 96:13 98:9	191:15 196:6 204:2	tiny 17:4	Treaty-interpretive	tweaked 61:5 Twenty 2:9,10
137:3 143:18	100:25 101:2 102:5	204:15,24 205:6	tiring 271:24	103:5	twice 2:23 20:14 43:1
269:14	109:15 115:15	206:19 230:16	titled 124:11	Treaty-specific	99:1 106:8 120:13
technique 170:10	116:6 134:6 139:19	234:18 246:22	today 2:3,25 19:21	257:19	121:8 150:7 231:16
techniques 136:24	140:9,22 142:7,25	268:16	23:1 56:23 195:25	trees 213:4	231:22 258:10
151:12	159:25 168:10,19	thoughts 99:8	220:23 228:24	trespass 175:18	259:14,17
technologies 220:5,10	189:19,23 193:18	thousands 253:11,14	264:22	Trevor 1:23	two 9:22 12:1 27:2
227:15	195:9,10,15 196:2	threads 110:15 145:9	together 4:8 32:13	tribunal 192:1 194:19	31:7 33:9 42:16
technology 220:7,14 220:19	202:25 204:2,14	210:25	39:12 42:16 80:8	195:5 199:7,13,15	52:16 63:2,18,19
220:19 telegraph 197:18	206:2 253:13 265:12,14 266:14	threat 35:17 216:25 three 6:8 36:20 103:12	82:1 110:15 121:5 126:5 138:11 145:9	199:19,21 200:5 202:2	70:3 72:13 79:11 98:2 99:23 100:3
tell 12:19 28:21	271:21,22 272:6,10	108:4 111:13	163:6 179:22 210:6	tribunals 191:16,25	102:8 118:24 120:5
128:12	thanks 73:6,7 261:10	137:14 143:11	210:15 211:1	trickle 87:23	129:6 144:10 145:7
telling 43:18 153:4	their 7:3 9:10 11:11	178:13 190:4	234:13 255:10,11	tried 126:21 210:20	145:14 147:21
tells 29:6,17 36:22	11:12 18:18 19:9,12	196:11 219:2,16	271:24	trips 222:18	162:16 168:25
49:17 136:2	37:20 48:1 60:13	228:23 229:2	told 8:22 45:14 64:23	trouble 120:4 258:7	170:18 174:1 177:2
template 117:20	67:25 116:18	236:15	132:19 139:2 204:8	true 37:18 95:18	191:20 194:2 195:8
Temple 170:23	148:21 160:22	three-step 110:17	235:22	123:7 167:21	196:7 200:8 201:11
temporarily 7:23	164:7 174:18	threshold 203:17	tolerance 264:21	173:14 203:17	203:8 204:17 208:1
29:12	188:25 203:8	205:21	tomorrow 141:21 142:5 202:22	truly 104:22	209:13 224:3
temporary 110:6 ten 63:11 221:2	209:10 214:1 219:23 223:9 231:2	throat 102:1 through 4:21 7:22	142:5 202:22 265:20	truths 59:7 try 148:3 175:8	230:19,20,24,25 236:15 245:18
262:19	242:3 271:22	9:20 20:17 29:13	tongue 222:19	210:21,23 211:11	246:18 249:21
tend 264:22	theme 208:14	32:17 35:6 36:23,25	tools 60:5 112:15	233:20 266:2 267:4	253:5 264:25
tenor 201:15	themes 208:10 210:24	38:9 40:3,4 47:18	134:23	trying 17:11 26:2	267:11 270:18,21
tenor 201:15 term 8:9 30:23 43:7	themes 208:10 210:24 themselves 7:2 38:8	38:9 40:3,4 47:18 55:15,19 77:16,23	134:23 top 12:14 13:16 17:3	trying 17:11 26:2 58:21 93:2,18 98:1	271:9
		-			

255:21 257:14	216:22,23 256:7	until 29:12 142:14	V	violation 188:21	wants 107:5,9 125:22
259:21	259:15 261:24	195:7 204:8 270:16		virtually 94:23	125:25 215:24
typed-up 206:24	understandable	unusual 201:25	v 169:9,14 194:17	vision 36:3	warrant 60:25 220:4
types 190:5 192:14	174:16	204:20 210:12	195:5 249:14,18	visit 6:11 7:14 8:21	warranted 238:24
196:11	understanding 22:9	212:1	265:5,6	10:20 12:4 18:8	249:24 250:5
typical 108:14	30:4 119:11 129:1	unwind 228:22	validity 184:23	19:2 50:7 162:15	251:19
typically 49:8 53:4	131:8 138:24	updating 246:1,11	valuable 80:6 184:5	visited 5:4	wasn't 25:16 68:4
174:10 192:8	147:25 203:24	upper 23:12	value 82:19 84:20	visualise 78:3	202:4 256:19
174.10 192.8	217:5,11 261:16	upstream 24:21 39:24	89:21,23 95:9	vis-à-vis 194:5	watched 160:15
U	understands 111:17	153:3 155:15	125:14 146:4	vital 179:14	water 2:4 3:21 5:6,9
	understood 24:25	urged 185:19	190:18	vivendi 37:11	6:14,22 7:19,21,24
Ukraine 181:9,18	38:4,19 52:10 81:13	urges 186:1	values 26:13,15 46:23	VI(1) 65:17	8:2,6,13 9:8 11:1
182:3	100:12 120:2	usable 89:25 102:10	86:5 89:2 112:25	voice 245:25	13:2 21:24 22:22
Ukraine's 181:14	undertake 18:10	231:15,21	113:1 131:11	volume 4:3 6:14 13:2	23:10,12 24:21,22
ultimately 47:2 51:8	103:4 150:22 251:7	USACE 104:6	variability 92:8	14:12 23:14 24:1,9	34:22,25 35:1,3,22
115:11 208:21	undertaken 269:1,15	use 1:15 6:23 10:8	variable 49:21 120:9	33:8 34:14,15 39:1	39:16,23 40:2,20
256:12	undertaking 73:10	18:13 21:1 22:18	122:20	39:23 41:5 51:24	41:8 49:23 50:12,17
ultra 183:20 185:24	193:12	24:19 34:23 35:2,21	variation 92:24 234:6	58:19,21 59:21 61:2	50:19 53:9 64:5
unaddressed 141:22	undoubtedly 226:3	37:22 38:12 41:25	variations 8:14 29:22	61:13 62:19 65:16	65:6 68:25 69:9
unavoidably 21:13	unduly 24:22 155:20	60:13 64:5 71:19	42:20 65:7,24 120:7	73:11 74:14 77:23	71:19 74:2,6,10
uncertainties 130:17	unequivocally 44:14	99:21 107:14,18	120:8,16 121:2,13	80:24 81:3,5 82:13	77:15 78:19 79:2
uncertainty 197:4,8	unexpected 19:14	112:17 121:19	122:5 125:12	84:10,13 86:17 87:2	81:12 82:9,11 83:18
198:24 257:10	unfit 61:1 112:21	122:24 125:23	varies 5:1 30:9 55:7	87:8,18,19 88:7,9	83:25 87:12 88:2
unchanged 152:2	135:3	122.24 125.25 128:8 129:25 130:1	variety 82:17	89:23 90:1 91:3	91:24 99:13 107:9
157:10 165:9	unfold 43:18 192:3,5	156:17 160:18,23	various 3:16 27:21	99:12,21 106:24	107:16 109:1
unchanging 58:19	Unfortunately 204:6	177:1 179:12	28:15 34:11 47:18	111:2,9 112:12	110:11 122:24
unclear 218:6	ungated 146:25	211:18,21 212:4,5	68:20 86:4 116:10	120:6 124:7 126:11	124:7 136:10
uncomplicated 188:17	150:15,18 164:13	213:7 214:17	230:14	131:21 132:24	148:22 149:2
uncontrollable 29:8	ungenerous 106:12	215:12,18,19	vary 18:20 31:21	148:8 153:22	155:13 214:11
33:4 110:7	unhappy 242:20	229:23 248:1,1	74:17 123:6	154:18 214:2,9	216:25 217:18
uncontrolled 29:14	unilateral 229:15	249:10,11 264:7,10	Vaughn 1:23	231:15,21	218:3,12 221:15
under 2:5 3:25 4:2	unilaterally 30:19	264:13,15 266:22	VCLT 41:24 44:10	volumes 82:19 131:13	222:24 226:9 230:8
15:21 16:13 17:20	62:3 123:20 135:13	266:23 267:20	vein 32:9	vortexing 155:13	230:9 231:15,16,21
21:2,3,6 24:12 25:4	unique 59:21 89:21	used 6:15 7:11 12:17	Venezuela 169:9	vortices 148:24	231:22 233:3 234:6
25:6 26:13 27:4	112:12 146:4	12:22 33:6 41:11	ventilated 52:3	160:13	245:22,23 250:16
34:5 41:8 47:13,16	United 199:17 265:5	44:16 52:21 61:11	versus 25:22 68:13	vulnerabilities 178:11	256:10
49:10,17 53:24	units 8:24	75:13 79:25 80:7	194:18 233:14	vulnerability 174:19	waters 1:2 2:4 19:22
57:20 61:20 71:17	University 35:14	84:10 87:11,12	vertical 153:14	174:19 175:14	21:2,7,8 22:2,18
103:20 105:6	unknown 60:10	91:17 93:21 110:2,4	Verulam 2:10,11	vulnerable 4:25	23:19 24:19 34:21
110:20 111:10	unless 1:5 137:6 166:6	126:6 147:4 150:7	vestiges 45:12,16	vullieruble 1.25	38:8,10 58:6 65:14
117:1,2,19 119:10	186:25 189:21	249:3 258:24	vexatious 174:20	W	65:16 69:18 119:22
124:22 128:24	195:7 214:11	useful 7:6 13:6,9	vi 135:17 249:18	WAHEED 2:6	121:19 129:7,25
131:8 133:9,14,16	271:20	26:16 59:10 121:20	via 34:1 156:9	waffeed 2:6 wait 90:23 266:16	130:1 133:25
135:6 136:7,22	unlike 20:8	130:21 159:8	view 8:16 11:12 14:22		147:17 166:2
138:19 139:20	unlikely 241:14	175:22 200:17	22:23 23:6 37:25	waiting 168:12	211:18 213:17,23
140:5 141:23	unlimited 25:20	211:1 214:14,21	38:17 41:4 44:3	walk 207:14 246:17	214:3,10 215:24
144:14,18,24 145:4	unnecessary 244:20	215:4 268:18 269:4	46:3 51:10 95:1	247:14	218:16 225:18,19
148:8 155:23 163:1	unpack 32:21 90:4	usefulness 183:7	96:6 102:23 149:23	walked 262:12 wall 28:13,17 33:13	225:21 226:3,6
164:6 166:21 167:5 167:11 172:6,25	240:12,13	184:2	150:13 153:17	155:17 162:20	watersheds 254:21
176:12 178:22	unpacked 240:9,10	users 30:6	155:20 159:1	want 31:25 37:24 38:1	watts 50:9,20
180:4,24 181:4,18	unqualified 175:14	uses 21:9 43:13	160:20 161:18	62:10 71:7 92:2	way 17:5,12 18:6 20:5
182:5 183:9 184:16	unquestionably 175:6	using 11:7 12:23	176:22 181:10	93:14 98:12 113:5	23:20 41:10 45:16
185:8 186:7 187:21	unrealistic 232:25	22:21 60:5,14 68:16	185:20 203:11	93:14 98:12 113:5 116:18 125:19	49:2 60:18 61:21
192:10 204:23	unreasonable 106:2	79:8,20 94:8 99:16	217:19,20 218:23	141:21 146:25	64:15 68:11 70:17
212:4 219:3,4 220:9	125:21	107:13 110:18	218:24 232:21	161:19 192:7	77:13,21 79:6 84:12
212:4 219:3,4 220:9 222:5 223:1,2 227:6	unresolved 225:4	112:15 126:7	237:17 263:21	197:19 211:14	90:23 92:13,22
222:5 223:1,2 227:6	unrestricted 21:1	134:22 135:1,10	270:1,13	218:18 225:15	93:11 94:1,3,4,6,7
233:10 248:20	211:18,21 212:4,5	182:16	viewed 192:18	229:8,8 232:14	95:4 97:1,21 98:19
268:21	212:13 213:7	usual 30:4 41:24	views 45:10	236:17 245:5	98:22 99:5,10,18
underneath 212:8	214:17 215:11	71:23 188:14	Vihear 170:24	246:24 252:10	100:15 104:15
underpinning 46:9	unsafe 237:17	199:22	vii 225:13 249:19	253:8 264:20 265:4	106:12 107:1 109:1
underscores 185:4	unsound 237:17	usually 8:13 18:2 65:6	254:1,5,12	266:8,8,9,23 268:3	117:24 119:12
undersluices 156:12	unsuitable 158:10	147:2 170:20	viii 249:19	wanted 37:8 38:13	125:18 127:11,12
understand 17:11	unsurprising 86:12	199:22,24 224:13	VII(2) 225:16 226:4	103:13 108:7 115:4	129:18 131:21
38:1 45:11 91:11	121:17 249:21	utilisation 38:8 69:18	255:12	115:14 228:9	141:5 157:21 158:6
99:6 100:16 114:16	259:12	69:21 129:7	VILMANTE 2:21	234:18 236:15	158:8 161:4 162:3,8
140:18 143:17	unsurprisingly 246:1	utilised 56:14 77:11	violate 110:10	265:23 268:2	168:2 180:7 181:22
168:11 190:11,12	untethered 127:5	Utility 4:4 168:17	violated 124:6	269:13	191:3 192:18 193:1
100.11 170.11,12			violates 124:3	207.15	

	,				
193:22 199:13,24	93:25 94:25 97:22	204:23 206:7,18	197:11 198:19	worth 35:13,19 67:1	149:14 158:17
201:21 202:15	99:2 100:10 114:24	233:23 243:13,22	199:6,12 201:9	257:12	160:1 242:4 254:12
204:20 205:19	130:21 139:4	259:21 267:24	219:2 247:13	wouldn't 54:20 57:15	1(a) 3:25 143:4,12,22
206:4,16 210:14	146:20 148:21	270:11	252:22 258:2 259:9	99:5 109:7 198:21	145:12 147:12
212:8,10 214:16,19	149:17 153:23	we're 3:9 14:22,23	270:4	WOUTER 1:12	152:25
212:3,10 214:10,19	157:13 164:3,5,22	16:9 25:24 29:4	wholly 121:17 146:19		1 (b) 143:13,25 147:11
219.7 221.0 222.24 225:7 233:3 240:19	167:1,12 168:8	31:18,24 37:1 38:2	wide 153:12 169:9	wrap-up 137:5 wriggle 141:9	152:23
	172:25 174:6	-		write 244:13	1,000 17:4,6,7,9 50:13
241:18,19 250:14		38:6 42:12 46:21	widely 118:21		
261:6 ways 45:3 93:3 100:13	176:11 177:18	57:10 58:21 60:19	wider 20:16 21:15	writing 1:14 35:24 176:17 270:5	271:2 1,008 147:21 161:5
	186:10 191:12,19	68:2 73:10 77:5,17	104:21 114:20 121:17 176:21	written 1:16 141:12	1,008 147:21 101:5 1,011 148:13
101:5 162:16 196:23 197:10	192:14 198:5,17 200:7 213:2 218:5	86:19,20,22 92:12	219:23 221:7	141:21 142:4 176:1	/
weak 222:20		94:7 96:25 106:9,9 113:18 115:20			1,015 147:19 161:5
weak 222:20 weaponisation 36:19	218:20 223:24 225:12 226:4	116:23 142:24	wider-spread 218:14 widespread 177:1	195:3 234:2,10 265:19 270:3,4	1,019 163:11 1,047.5 163:9
216:13,25 218:2,11	228:15 233:2	146:18,19 147:25	WILLIAMS 2:20	wrong 16:25 96:25	1,064.4 163:8
		-	winds 207:1	0	1,069.4 163:7
weaponised 35:4	252:17 255:14	154:24,25 155:4		117:16 118:1,14	1.009.4 105.7 1-in-50-year 150:25
Webb 2:10 14:6 20:20	256:2,3 260:15	161:8 163:6,12	winter 126:16	122:7 129:23	
21:10 34:10 45:11	266:24 268:10,16	166:6 167:2,3	wisdom 201:22	224:25 238:3 261:3	1.06 137:9
146:7 155:17	269:10 272:8	191:18,18 193:12	wish 141:12 171:10	261:7	1.1 155:22
219:11 224:2	well-developed 203:3	195:24 196:15	252:17 256:21	wrongly 153:18	1.13 142:13
225:12 265:3,13 Webb's 263:4	203:22 221:18	200:20 203:4,7	261:5 272:7	wrote 217:9 255:24	1.25 87:1 88:9
	well-reasoned 190:10	213:25 226:20	wishes 212:19 221:14	V	1.3 148:15
wedded 158:14 Wednesday 126:14	well-tried-and-tested	231:24,25 233:4,5	wishing 56:5	<u> </u>	1.41 87:18
Wednesday 126:14	221:18	240:16 245:17	withdrawal 213:24	x 229:10 249:23	1.62 82:15
169:1	went 24:8 90:8 200:10	246:20 257:8,19,20	withholding 35:4	xi 250:4	10 8:19 46:22 108:1,2
week 3:9 56:1,25	204:13	269:10 272:2	225:5		162:7 271:1
125:15,16,20	were 16:20 24:15	we've 2:16,20 14:19	withstand 174:4	Y	10% 162:25
127:18 128:2,3,7,8	30:23 36:1 37:20	27:19 28:3,15,20	wonder 48:4 97:12	yardstick 59:10 162:3	10-day 46:19,20,23
128:10,10 145:10	51:14 52:16 60:6	30:4,5 31:19 32:10	108:15 109:3,8	year 5:2,5 10:6 16:4	47:1,6,21
174:14 190:22	61:11 67:18 68:10	32:17 35:16 47:2	116:1 159:2	46:18,22 47:1 48:16	100 12:24 50:24 51:16
193:23 199:4	95:12 101:22	50:23 52:15,22 65:3	wondering 15:6 16:24	48:18,20,21,24	78:4,22 81:23 271:1
208:15 210:20,24	113:12 114:17	65:11,20 66:22 78:3	211:7 261:20	49:16,18 56:13	100% 12:10 82:18
211:6 229:2 232:8	115:16 122:9	82:4 86:4 87:10,25	wood 213:4	74:10 109:21 113:2	83:1 84:4 86:9
232:20 233:23	134:25 141:15	95:4 103:4 104:6,10	word 55:5 75:12	114:7,18 127:15	106.51 105:14
245:10,25 246:16	142:20 144:3	107:4 117:5 135:7	231:18 267:20	130:15 157:16	107 3:20
248:21 271:23	149:24 150:12	135:17,20,22 145:3	worded 39:7	221:2	11 11:14 47:21 48:9
272:5	152:21 187:15	147:22 148:4	words 29:20 89:21	years 46:16,25 47:11	153:1 267:3
weekend 9:22 71:10	192:25 197:7 198:9	151:20,22,23 152:2	99:18 101:13 118:7	105:10 113:1	11.08 72:6
107:10 193:17,19	200:12 206:10	153:11 159:22	129:19,20 182:16	114:21 115:8 118:5	11.3 86:1
202:7 245:22	209:6,12 222:25	161:6,20,20 162:20	184:13 205:19	130:10 137:20,22	11.39 72:8
253:23 265:13	227:3 230:14 239:3	162:20,23 163:4,18	219:22 225:15	173:23 188:13,14	11.40 72:5
271:15 272:4,7	256:14 257:10	165:5 168:1 191:21	231:13 240:24	199:19 209:1 221:2	11.43 59:9
weekly 9:25 10:12,14	258:18 259:16	203:5,15 209:13	work 6:13 7:1 9:24	221:2 228:11	11.45 46:10
29:22 30:2 32:11,12	262:20,21 263:5,6	210:19,21 211:10	47:18 52:19 58:24	year-round 6:17	11.49 46:11
32:14 49:3 56:13	269:8 270:21	211:24 213:12,21	224:1 225:18,21	yeoman's 271:25	11.57 73:14
63:5,8,19 64:2,7	weren't 116:14 135:10	215:14,15,16	226:8,11,13 232:14	yesterday 2:4 14:6	113 3:21
65:25 66:7,18,21	Western 3:4,22 21:2,7	216:14 217:4	232:23 253:22	18:22 20:8 23:5	115 22:15
67:3,5,7,9,15,17	21:25 22:4,18 23:10	226:23 232:12	260:17 265:13	27:17 29:10,16 35:8	12 1:6 1:1 11:24 16:18
68:2,13,21 69:2	23:16,20,21 24:19	233:19 241:19	269:16 271:25	139:5	87:10,15,17 88:5
71:18 76:25 93:22	25:1,9 27:4 34:21	242:18 249:21	workable 157:1	Y-axis 12:18 17:2,3	89:24 91:14,15
120:7,16 122:15	35:11 36:2 38:10,11	250:24 258:3,16	204:23	- · · /-	102:6 107:5 111:2
233:14 257:1,5,16	39:19 58:7 69:18	265:23 267:20	workarounds 223:10	Z	146:6 158:18
258:24 259:7,7	71:16,19 104:22	268:25 269:2,10	worked 35:14 156:22	zero 17:3 24:11 83:2	125 125:5,15
260:1	109:19 111:22,24	271:14	165:2 199:14	89:10 100:9 132:8	125.68 125:2,10 132:3
weeks 270:21	119:23 121:19	Wheeler 258:8	working 9:18,20	ZOHAIR 2:6	155:1
weight 43:12	122:24 129:25	Wheeler's 258:11	255:3	zone 28:18	13 14:13 17:16 160:1
welcome 1:3 72:9	133:25 136:11	while 5:24 24:20 25:8	workings 223:9	zones 170:13	205:2 208:2,8 236:1
115:22 116:3 141:6	165:17 166:2	54:7 80:1,4 89:2	works 20:12 21:25	201105 170.13	240:3
168:14 193:15,16	211:18 215:20	90:17 112:2 118:11	25:3 67:25 81:17	0	13-25 173:20
welcomed 201:22	221:5,11,21 223:7	119:8 155:12	132:21 228:4,10		13.10 186:8
welcomes 243:23	223:12,16	175:15 181:9	262:24	0 17:2,2 82:17 84:4	13.14 197:1
well 5:7 9:15 16:8 17:6	wet 5:6,20 6:14,23	185:22 192:25	world 125:22 209:7	86:14,15,17	13.18 241:21 242:10
24:25 29:4 31:12	10:20 13:8 49:23	204:16 245:17	217:8 228:11	0.9 50:25	13.19 241:5
35:25 38:3,6,14	109:22	whilst 68:16 110:5	261:22,23		13.29 207:16 245:15
41:2 42:17 46:5	we'll 27:14 46:3 48:6	164:11 176:9	world's 255:1	1	246:20,25
52:10 58:2 59:2	56:21 57:9 76:16	187:12	worse 36:5	1 2:2 17:7 50:20 90:7	13.30 207:16 245:15
66:1 78:8,15 81:13	81:23 98:5,7 139:1	whistle-stop 145:22	worst 35:2 49:4	91:4 115:25 143:6	250:24
83:21 92:12,25	142:21 160:2	whole 14:19 74:20	101:16	143:16,21 145:7,18	130% 40:16,25 108:17
1	1	1			I

Trevor McGowan

Page 25

122.5	2(b) 3:25 27:25 66:12	24 5:18 6:1 11:18 12:8	241:10	572 265.5	57.24 59.22 50.12
123:5				572 265:5	57:24 58:23 59:13
131 125:1,4	66:13,25 143:5,13	13:3 39:5 53:4	35(a) 241:12,15 242:8	58 126:25	59:19,25 60:11
132 3:22	144:5 145:13	73:10 77:16,18 78:6	248:20	58.3 104:10,17	62:17,24 66:6 73:6
137 3:23	176:13	78:10,17,20 79:7,8	35(d) 2:8 4:10	59 127:16	74:4 75:1 76:18
14 3:4 11:19 18:25	2(c) 29:5,17 30:15	79:17 80:3,12 82:6	36 3:7 46:22 47:3,4	598 265:7	95:18 98:24 99:19
104:7 161:2	32:3 42:19 63:6,15	84:14 86:11,24 88:1	68:2 176:12		103:20,24 104:4,23
143 3:24 4:1 169:6	65:19 66:24 119:17	100:6,9,19 104:7	36.6 101:14	6	105:19,23 106:4,22
144.5 153:15	120:20,24 121:11	110:23 136:15,16	37 68:19	6 4:12 17:2 82:10,13	107:21 110:9,16
15 19:23 39:7,8 41:4	134:16 136:20	233:14	37.5 126:19 131:14	87:13,16,17 88:4	111:13,16,17
41:10,22 42:1 66:1	259:8	24-hour 11:1 12:20	38 75:9	188:23 240:8	112:12 117:3
67:20 68:2,14 69:6	2(d) 28:3	13:1 40:14,16,21,22	39 73:12	244:22	119:18 120:21
107:2,11,19,22	2(e) 29:6	40:25 41:1 63:4,24		6.00 31:18	121:6,7 122:17
108:9,15 109:6,10	2(f) 28:8	71:23 73:23 74:16	4		123:23 124:1,2,2
109:11,17,25	2(g) 28:23	77:10.17 78:25 79:3		6.22 131:16	126:11 127:7
		,	4 2:14 91:5 111:20	6.48 81:20	
110:10 111:23	2(h) 65:20 66:24	79:5 81:1,4 83:12	144:10 149:12	6.5 118:24 119:1	128:11,24 134:15
112:7 122:25 123:1	2(i) 43:9 44:7,13,15,18	83:20 84:3,11,16	195:20	6.5.7 131:4	136:1 144:14 146:2
123:9,15,18 124:1,1	49:1 50:2 52:6	87:11,12 88:18 90:1	4(h) 66:12,17,25	60 127:21 173:23	148:9 166:22
124:4,6 126:6 128:5	54:20 56:18 57:24	99:25 102:14	4,888 6:20	61 128:18	230:20 231:12
129:12 130:10	63:10 66:17 73:6	105:12,21,25 111:5	/	62 3:14	249:20 250:2
131:2 132:10	110:19 111:17	112:4 234:1,15	4.10 202:23		8(c)) 120:11
		-	4.16 206:20	624 106:11	8(d) 20:5 144:22 145:2
134:16 135:11	120:22 121:6,7	259:11	4.67 14:15 17:18	63 134:10 137:15	
136:21 154:1 160:8	122:17 124:16	24-hourly 65:12	40 77:5 163:13	64 3:15 135:17	146:20 149:22
161:15 165:1	134:15 136:2 146:2	24.72 105:12	40% 12:25	64,000 82:5	156:14 198:13
213:10	230:22 232:6,9	25 3:5 42:11 46:16,25	41 78:2	65 135:20	227:18 249:15,18
15(ii) 39:13 40:22	233:10	47:1,11 78:12,20	41:59 163:5	65.3 47:19 51:3 86:3	250:2
15(i) 39:13 40:19	2(j) 49:12 127:14	105:10 114:21	41.39 103.3 42 81:10	89:6	8(e) 20:6 144:24
15(1) 59.15 40.19 158 4:2	230:10	115:8 137:20,22			249:19 250:2
16 20:1 40:6 41:1	2,000 133:4 229:8,9	25-year 46:23 114:7	43 3:8 82:21	66 135:22	
		2	44 3:9 85:23	66.7 86:19 88:10	8(f) 144:18 146:14
86:22 87:25 88:1,2	232:25	253 4:14	45 88:24 141:17 143:1	690 7:8 167:23	249:19 250:2
88:11	2.00 142:14,15	26 44:7	450 131:19 162:4		8-compliant 152:8,21
16.28 131:5	2.17 142:17	26(6) 183:10	46 104:5	7	8.00 40:7 41:2
166 4:3	2.2 162:9	265 4:15	47 3:10 106:5		8.5 131:22
168 4:4,6	2.48 148:14	27 50:5 239:23 253:7		7 4:24 14:21 26:14	801 154:12
17 20:18 154:21	2.49 166:8	28 50:22 239:23	48 110:15	48:1,1 145:18	818 154:4
			49 111:10	177:21 235:23	
18 2:17 22:23 82:6,7,9	2.53 168:16	280 5:23	49.11 125:16	247:21	821 153:25
18.75 126:18	2.82 106:11	29 52:15 218:20		7.59 40:8 41:2	839.3 155:6
1899 169:9	20 12:19 16:23 28:12		5	70 3:16	84 3:18 173:19
19 27:19 105:21 228:6	47:21 48:9 118:5	3	5 1:6 3:5 6:10 36:3	70% 40:15 108:22	840 153:9
190 4:7	130:10 143:12	3 2:10,11 2:7 113:6			844 265:5
1948 35:5 37:13,14	188:13	132:6,13 137:17	105:20 138:2	72 131:10 132:6	
1950 258:19	200 16:23 17:5,10	-	139:20 145:5	75 3:17 78:5,9,16,21	9
1950 236:19 1950s 216:19 258:2	2001 170:16	143:10 149:13	198:14	81:19 82:12,14	
		169:6,9 173:19	5,000 221:12,14	75% 81:25 83:14	9 8:8 47:16 61:20
1959 22:14	2004 130:13	191:6 244:1 249:4	5.26 253:24		105:6 151:16 225:8
196 4:8,10	201 221:12,14,20	3(b) 138:9	5.30 206:25 245:12	8	9.30 266:8
1960 1:2 60:7 68:11	239:14	3.25 190:2	5.33 86:25 88:3		9.34 1:2
70:10 112:17	2010 35:24 72:14	3.34 195:21		8 2:16 6:8 11:19,20	9.35 1:25
136:24,25 216:20	118:8	3.59 195:23	5.43 155:3	20:9 28:24 39:10	9.6 13:4
217:6,13,19 221:23	2012 171:3	3.8 106:18 131:21	5.53 272:11	42:2 86:23 87:4,24	9.81 50:15
1960s 134:23 220:19	2013 170:24		5.9 118:24,24	88:1 104:7,8 106:19	
258:19	2013 170.24 2014 265:6	147:23 161:6	5.9.2 120:4 122:11	143:19,23 144:1,3,6	90 3:19
1969 200:9	2014 203.0 2015 117:8	30 3:6 54:4 56:5	5.9.3 124:13	145:9,15 147:15,25	90% 50:18,25 83:6
		171:12 188:24	5.9.5 127:2	151:4 154:13	162:25
1982/1983 199:16	2016 228:6	267:16 268:21	50 51:16 116:21	214:24 227:8 241:3	969 7:13 106:15
1988 227:3	202 4:11	270:16	50% 40:24 83:22 85:6		131:19 162:2
1992 139:8 224:23	2023 265:8	30% 108:17,21 109:2	87:6,15,17 88:5	247:9,11 248:8	
225:3 250:12	2023-01 1:3	31 41:24 58:10 240:7		262:21	
1995 188:18	2024 1:6 1:1 143:12	31 (4) 44:10 124:18	89:24 102:7 107:4	8(a) 29:16 145:4 149:9	
	206 4:12,13		108:23 111:2 123:5	149:19 160:21	
2	21 28:21 85:3,22 117:8	32 59:4 94:14	146:5	164:15 242:14	
		32.56 131:7 132:4	504 23:7 26:24 51:22	249:20 250:2	
2 3:1,3 21:4,5 22:1	131:10	162:5	506 67:22	8(a)-compliant 149:10	
27:15 34:5 85:16	21.75 161:25 163:14	321 198:16	51 117:5	164:25	
87:17,17 91:3	217.5 163:1	322 198:18	52 118:23		
140:18 142:12	22 32:23 38:22 163:2	323 198:17		8(b) 230:4	
144:4 146:6 158:18	221 244:2	33 63:9 240:8	53 3:11 119:4	8(c) 2:5,10,15 4:3 20:2	
	222 244:2		54 119:13	20:5,9 23:1 24:6	
160:2 191:6 213:18	23 35:13 169:22	33% 104:20	55 3:12 122:6	27:12,14 28:7 36:7	
214:5 225:13 254:2		33.3 87:23 104:17	56 124:9	36:25 37:17 39:5	
254:6,12,13 262:15	176:16 183:10	34 65:9	57 3:13 125:6	41:15,23 42:7,12,22	
262:16,22	197:3 199:1	35 67:21 154:11 239:3	57.42 148:6 161:24	43:5,7 45:25 52:7	
2(a) 27:23 145:16	23% 105:15	239:6 240:21	57.65 51:1,6	-	
				54:10,22 55:22	

Trevor McGowan

Page 26