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:

Dean D. Man

Professor Sean D. Murphy Chairman

CERTIFIED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 19 OF ANNEXURE G

15 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 6

Monday, 15 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 RAJA NAEEM AKBAR, Secretary, Ministry of Law & Justice (Deputy Agent) MR SYED MUHAMMAD MEHAR ALI SHAH, Commissioner for Indus Waters, Ministry of Water Resources MR ASAD KHAN BURKI, Legal Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs MR ZOHAIR WAHEED, Office of the Attorney General H.E. MR SULJUK MUSTANSAR TARAR, Ambassador of Pakistan to the Kingdom of The Netherlands MS FATIMA HAMDIA TANWEER, First Secretary, Embassy of Pakistan to the Kingdom of The Netherlands MR JAMAL NASIR, First Secretary, Embassy of Pakistan to the Kingdom of The Netherlands SIR DANIEL BETHLEHEM KC, Twenty Essex, London PROFESSOR PHILIPPA WEBB, Twenty Essex, London DR CAMERON MILES, 3 Verulam Buildings, London PROFESSOR ATTILA TANZI, 3 Verulam Buildings, London MR STEPHEN FIETTA KC, Fietta LLP, London MS LAURA REES-EVANS, Fietta LLP, London MR ABDULLAH TARIQ, Fietta LLP, London MS MEGAN RIPPIN, Fietta LLP, London DR GREGORY L MORRIS, Technical Advisor MR PETER J RAE, Technical Advisor

THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA WAS NOT REPRESENTED

FOR THE PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION

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

Second-Round Opening Statement on behalf of2
the Islamic Republic of Pakistan
By Sir Daniel Bethlehem2
Court questions
Court questions
Submissions on Engineering Issues Relevant to58
Pondage
By Mr Rae58
Court questions
Court questions
Questions from THE COURT

13:14	1 Monday, 15 July 2024	14:09 1	scheme, just before the mid-afternoon coffee break
13.14	2 (2.07 pm)		-
	-	23	tomorrow.
	5		But I have to say that so far, the best laid plans in terms of timing have gone awry, both for our
	4 hearing, and this will be the second round of5 submissions by Pakistan.	4	
	2	5	inclination to try and develop responses to questions
	6 I hope that everyone had as good a weekend as	6	from the microphone and also obviously your interest in
	7 possible, recognising that that possibility may have	7	putting questions to us. So the timing will depend
	8 been diminished somewhat by the work you had before you,	8	a little bit on the questions that come.
	9 which we can already see in some of the materials that	9	I will take you through the scheme briefly to make
	10 you've recently sent in our direction.	10	one or two comments so that you have a clearer sense of
	We also do have a notional sense of your timing for	11	how we propose to proceed.
	12 the presentations today and tomorrow, and are very	12	As a preliminary point, Mr Chairman, on Friday when
	13 grateful for receiving that.	13	we closed, you indicated that the Court would be handing
	14 So I see Sir Daniel at the podium. Are there any	14	down questions, and indeed we got those on Saturday, as
	15 matters we need to discuss before we perhaps launch in	15	proposed. And you indicated that a number of the
	16 on your opening submissions?	16	questions would be picking up questions that you had put
	17 SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. We hope you all had	17	orally. We have seen that, and we have noted that in
	18 a good weekend, perhaps free from the burdens of having	18	fact in a number of cases we have answered those
	19 to go over transcript submissions.	19	questions, or at least addressed them fairly fully, in
	20 There's just one housekeeping point, and that is	20	the first-round submissions.
	that on Day 2 of the hearing, Ms Rees-Evans referred, in	21	So where this is the case, what we propose to do
	her answer to the Court's question regarding the 1948	22	and I'll start this off, but all of my colleagues will
	23 water dispute, to a Pakistani publication of 1952	23	address this as we go through is we propose to
	setting out Pakistan's position on the history of that	24	provide transcript references to the places in the
	dispute. That's transcript Day 2 at page 26, line 24 to	25	transcript where we addressed these points in the first
	Page 1		Page 3
14:08	1 page 28, line 9. The correct exhibit reference for that	14:11 1	round, and then we will add any additional observations
14:08	 page 28, line 9. The correct exhibit reference for that publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript 	14:11 1 2	round, and then we will add any additional observations that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply
14:08			-
14:08	2 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript	2	that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply
14:08	2 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript3 correction: P-0350.	2 3	that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round.
14:08	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. 	2 3 4	that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our
14:08	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There 	2 3 4 5	that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment,
14:08	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. 	2 3 4 5 6	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but
14:08	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal 	2 3 4 5 6 7	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow.
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation.
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your opening submissions. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your opening submissions. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. (2.09 pm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these questions in a little bit of detail and so I will be
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your opening submissions. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. (2.09 pm) Second-Round Opening Statement on behalf of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these questions in a little bit of detail and so I will be reasonably brief. But in some cases, for example on the information-sharing, I think that there is a fair amount to elaborate on.
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your opening submissions. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. (2.09 pm) Second-Round Opening Statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic 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} $	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these questions in a little bit of detail and so I will be reasonably brief. But in some cases, for example on the information-sharing, I think that there is a fair amount to elaborate on.
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your opening submissions. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. (2.09 pm) Second-Round Opening Statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan SIR DANIEL: You have before you the draft scheme of our 	$ \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 may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these questions in a little bit of detail and so I will be reasonably brief. But in some cases, for example on the information-sharing, I think that there is a fair amount to elaborate on. I will also address in my opening remarks now, this afternoon, Mr Chairman, your enquiry about a preliminary
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your opening submissions. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. (2.09 pm) Second-Round Opening Statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan SIR DANIEL: You have before you the draft scheme of our second-round submissions. And as you will see from 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these questions in a little bit of detail and so I will be reasonably brief. But in some cases, for example on the information-sharing, I think that there is a fair amount to elaborate on. I will also address in my opening remarks now, this afternoon, Mr Chairman, your enquiry about a preliminary partial award addressing question 35(a) and perhaps
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your opening submissions. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. (2.09 pm) Second-Round Opening Statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan SIR DANIEL: You have before you the draft scheme of our second-round submissions. And as you will see from that, we do not expect to use all of the time available 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these questions in a little bit of detail and so I will be reasonably brief. But in some cases, for example on the information-sharing, I think that there is a fair amount to elaborate on. I will also address in my opening remarks now, this afternoon, Mr Chairman, your enquiry about a preliminary partial award addressing question 35(a) and perhaps other elements on a more expedited basis on the
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your opening submissions. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. (2.09 pm) Second-Round Opening Statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan SIR DANIEL: You have before you the draft scheme of our second-round submissions. And as you will see from 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these questions in a little bit of detail and so I will be reasonably brief. But in some cases, for example on the information-sharing, I think that there is a fair amount to elaborate on. I will also address in my opening remarks now, this afternoon, Mr Chairman, your enquiry about a preliminary partial award addressing question 35(a) and perhaps
	 publication is P-0350. So that's just a transcript correction: P-0350. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you. SIR DANIEL: No other housekeeping points from us. There will, of course, be a number of them that come tomorrow. I should say that we were expecting that the Federal Secretary of the Ministry of Water Resources would in fact be in the hearing today, but he was detained in Islamabad unduly. We expect him to be arriving some time this afternoon, so that he will be here for the closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. No housekeeping matters on our end. So if that's the case, Sir Daniel, I invite you to commence with your opening submissions. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. (2.09 pm) Second-Round Opening Statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan SIR DANIEL: You have before you the draft scheme of our second-round submissions. And as you will see from that, we do not expect to use all of the time available 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 that may be appropriate. We don't propose to simply repeat what we've said in the first round. Following some brief comments on the scheme of our submissions, which I will come to in just a moment, I will turn to some brief not so brief now but substantive remarks addressing the following written questions in my opening presentation, and I will come back to a number of the questions in my closing presentation tomorrow. So today, what you will be hearing from me is a response to questions 3, 4(a) and 4(b), which in some shape or form all deal with information-sharing. I will then address question 6, on India's compliance with the Kishenganga award; and question 13, on weaponisation. In some cases, we've already responded to these questions in a little bit of detail and so I will be reasonably brief. But in some cases, for example on the information-sharing, I think that there is a fair amount to elaborate on. I will also address in my opening remarks now, this afternoon, Mr Chairman, your enquiry about a preliminary partial award addressing question 35(a) and perhaps other elements on a more expedited basis on the

14:12 1	detached from other elements of the Court's enquiry; and	14:15 1	longer.
2	second, that it may indeed be helpful, for wider	2	After the lunch break tomorrow, I will make some
3	reasons, for the party to have early clarity on these	3	closing observations addressing your questions 7(a) and
4	issues.	4	7(b), on issues concerning challenges to the competence
5	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I expect to be on	5	of the Neutral Expert. In fact, I think we've addressed
6	my feet for about 60 minutes. It probably won't be much	6	those at some length in the first round, so I'll just be
7	less; it could be a little bit longer, depending on your	7	pulling some of the threads together. I will also
8	questions. I will then hand on the baton to Mr Rae, who	8	address question 8 and the first part of question 9,
9	will be followed in turn by Dr Morris; that's assuming	9	which I think is divided into three sentences, but I'll
10	we get through Mr Rae's presentation in time, or	10	just address the first element that is concerning
11	otherwise Dr Morris will split his presentation between	11	Annexure E.
12	this afternoon and tomorrow.	12	I will also address tomorrow in my closing,
13	Mr Rae will focus largely on addressing engineering	13	Mr Chairman, your five-step scheme to this sequence for
14	aspects of your question on pondage, to provide	14	applying sources of law and practices.
15	an engineering foundation for the submissions that	15	And then, Inshallah, we assume that Mr Syed Ali
16	Mr Miles will make tomorrow. Dr Morris will range	16	Murtaza, the Federal Secretary of Pakistan's Ministry of
17	a little bit more widely across a number of your	17	Water Resources, will be here, and he will close
18	questions that call for engineering input: notably,	18	Pakistan's case with some brief concluding observations
19	those relating to sediment management, associated design	19	and a formal reading of Pakistan's final submissions.
20	issues and the issue of weaponisation. Between them,	20	So that's the scheme of what we propose over the
21	Mr Rae and Dr Morris expect to be on their feet for the	21	course of the next day and a half. You will see,
22	remainder of the afternoon.	22	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that we have some
23	On the schedule as planned, as you will see from the	23	contingency time built in, notably tomorrow afternoon.
24	handout, we anticipate having four substantive	24	So if timing begins to slip a little bit today or
25	presentations tomorrow, starting with Mr Fietta, who	25	tomorrow morning, we hope that we won't be unduly
	Page 5		Page 7
	Tage 5		Tage /
14:14 1	will address various issues concerning res judicata, but	14:17 1	anxious about that, and that there will be lots of time
14:14 1 2	will address various issues concerning res judicata, but with special focus on the binding effect of Court of	14:17 1 2	anxious about that, and that there will be lots of time to make up ground.
2	with special focus on the binding effect of Court of	2	to make up ground.
2 3	with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning.	2 3	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address
2 3 4	with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on	2 3 4	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will
2 3 4 5	with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that	2 3 4 5	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only
2 3 4 5 6	with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in	2 3 4 5 6	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but that will again depend on the questions that you may 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked: "When specifically in the planning stage does the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but that will again depend on the questions that you may have. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked: "When specifically in the planning stage does the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but that will again depend on the questions that you may have. She will be followed by Dr Miles, who will address 	$ \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 make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked: "When specifically in the planning stage does the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2) crystallize and what categories of information must 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} $	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but that will again depend on the questions that you may have. She will be followed by Dr Miles, who will address you on questions of pondage, building on Mr Rae's 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked: "When specifically in the planning stage does the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2) crystallize and what categories of information must be exchanged to make the notification process meaningful?"
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but that will again depend on the questions that you may have. She will be followed by Dr Miles, who will address you on questions of pondage, building on Mr Raa's submissions this afternoon. Dr Miles's scripted remarks 	$ \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 make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked: "When specifically in the planning stage does the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2) crystallize and what categories of information must be exchanged to make the notification process meaningful?" You will find elements of this question addressed at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but that will again depend on the questions that you may have. She will be followed by Dr Miles, who will address you on questions of pondage, building on Mr Rae's submissions this afternoon. Dr Miles's scripted remarks come in at about 75 minutes. But on the experience 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} $	 to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked: "When specifically in the planning stage does the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2) crystallize and what categories of information must be exchanged to make the notification process meaningful?" You will find elements of this question addressed at the following transcript references, and I'll just go
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but that will again depend on the questions that you may have. She will be followed by Dr Miles, who will address you on questions of pondage, building on Mr Rae's submissions this afternoon. Dr Miles's scripted remarks come in at about 75 minutes. But on the experience of Friday, we expect that you are likely to have lots 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} $	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked: "When specifically in the planning stage does the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2) crystallize and what categories of information must be exchanged to make the notification process meaningful?" You will find elements of this question addressed at the following transcript references, and I'll just go through them quickly: Day 1, page 199, line 7 to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but that will again depend on the questions that you may have. She will be followed by Dr Miles, who will address you on questions of pondage, building on Mr Rae's submissions this afternoon. Dr Miles's scripted remarks come in at about 75 minutes. But on the experience 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} $	 to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked: "When specifically in the planning stage does the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2) crystallize and what categories of information must be exchanged to make the notification process meaningful?" You will find elements of this question addressed at the following transcript references, and I'll just go
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 with special focus on the binding effect of Court of Arbitration awards and their underlying reasoning. You didn't address particular written questions on this aspect of our first-round submissions, but it was a topic of some discussion across the Court last week, and there are a number of points arising from that discussion which we thought may be helpful to pick up in connection with your question (a) in PO6. And we anticipate that Mr Fietta will need around about 40 minutes. Mr Fietta will be followed by Professor Webb, who will again address outlets, spillways and power intakes. We've taken it that the issues of treaty interpretation are well embedded, if you like, in your consciousness, and so we don't have a separate presentation on that. Professor Webb anticipates needing about 45 minutes, but that will again depend on the questions that you may have. She will be followed by Dr Miles, who will address you on questions of pondage, building on Mr Rae's submissions this afternoon. Dr Miles's scripted remarks come in at about 75 minutes. But on the experience of Friday, we expect that you are likely to have lots 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} $	to make up ground. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with that, I propose to turn to a number of your questions concerning information-sharing. And I will address question 3, question 4(a) and question 4(d), and I will take those together. I know that they don't only encompass information-sharing, but they usefully address some of the same rubric. Forgive me if at one or two points I'm going to become just a little bit pedestrian about this, because what I propose to do is to read into your transcript record the transcript references for last week that address these issues, so that when you come back to refresh your minds on these points, you've got all of those references there. So by question 3, you asked: "When specifically in the planning stage does the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2) crystallize and what categories of information must be exchanged to make the notification process meaningful?" You will find elements of this question addressed at the following transcript references, and I'll just go through them quickly: Day 1, page 199, line 7 to

14:18 1	line 12; Day 5, page 225, line 4 to page 227, line 4;	14:22 1	"sites", not just "works".
2	and Day 5, page 253, line 21 to page 255, line 23.	2	So in terms of the remit of the Commission,
3	Then by question 4(a), you asked whether "the	3	it's focused on cooperation, information exchange,
4	constraints that exist in the Treaty for the design of	4	facilitating tours of inspection in connection with the
5	a HEP establish an obligation on India when it selects	5	works and the sites on the rivers.
6	a site for a HEP"; and "If so, what is that obligation?"	6	I then come back to a provision that you will be
7	Once again, you will find elements of this question	7	very familiar with, and that's Article VII,
8	addressed at the following transcript references. There	8	paragraph (2), which we've looked at previously. The
9	are quite a number of them. Day 4, page 6, line 1 to	9	article is headed "Future Co-operation". And you will,
10	page 9, line 2; Day 4, page 113, line 8 to page 116,	10	I think, be very much aware that the notion of
11	line 3; Day 4, page 117, line 14 to page 121, line 16;	11	cooperation and future cooperation is a leitmotif of the
12	Day 4, page 123, lines 4-16; Day 4, page 176, line 7 to	12	Treaty and indeed is expressed in the preamble: the
13	page 177, line 3; Day 5, page 220, line 13 to page 221,	13	"cooperative spirit" animating the parties is expressed
14	line 4; and Day 5, page 223, line 19 to page 224,	14	in the preamble.
15	line 16.	15	I don't suggest that you call up Article VII,
16	I promise you there won't be too many more of these.	16	paragraph (2); you will have the essence of it in your
17	Finally, by question 4(d), you asked whether India	17	recollection. But I will just go over a number of
18	has "an obligation to provide Pakistan with	18	elements of it.
19	an opportunity to review site selection more than	19	As you will recall, the first sentence of
20	six months in advance of the beginning of construction".	20	Article VII(2) provides that:
21	You will find elements of this question addressed at	21	"If either Party plans"
22	the following transcript reference, and that's Day 5,	22	I'm emphasising the word "plans" for the moment:
23	page 253, line 21 to page 255, line 23. So that's the	23	"If either Party plans to construct any engineering
24	last of the transcript references, at least for now.	24	work which would cause interference with the waters of
25	Taking these three questions together, let me start	25	any of the Rivers and which, in its opinion, would
	Page 9		Page 11
	rage 9		rage 11
14:20 1	with some overarching observations.	14:23 1	affect the other Party materially, it shall notify the
14:20 1 2	with some overarching observations. The first is that the Treaty contains a number of	14:23 1 2	affect the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data
2	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of	2	other Party of its plans and shall supply such data
2 3	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions.	2 3	other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would
2 3 4	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange	2 3 4	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now	2 3 4 5 6 7	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present	2 3 4 5 6	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters"
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ \end{array} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And this article goes on to provide that the purpose and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it quite clear, in our submission, that the notification
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And this article goes on to provide that the purpose and functions of the Commission are to establish and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it quite clear, in our submission, that the notification and provision of data requirements of Article VII,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And this article goes on to provide that the purpose and functions of the Commission are to establish and maintain cooperative arrangements and to promote	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it quite clear, in our submission, that the notification and provision of data requirements of Article VII, paragraph (2) are intended to apply from the moment 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} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And this article goes on to provide that the purpose and functions of the Commission are to establish and maintain cooperative arrangements and to promote cooperation between the parties, including, amongst	$ \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} $	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it quite clear, in our submission, that the notification and provision of data requirements of Article VII, paragraph (2) are intended to apply from the moment that a party "plans" to construct an engineering work. 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} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And this article goes on to provide that the purpose and functions of the Commission are to establish and maintain cooperative arrangements and to promote cooperation between the parties, including, amongst other issues, in respect of facilitating tours of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it quite clear, in our submission, that the notification and provision of data requirements of Article VII, paragraph (2) are intended to apply from the moment that a party "plans" to construct an engineering work. That is the plain meaning of the words on the page.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And this article goes on to provide that the purpose and functions of the Commission are to establish and maintain cooperative arrangements and to promote cooperation between the parties, including, amongst other issues, in respect of facilitating tours of inspection, the purpose of which is "ascertaining the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it quite clear, in our submission, that the notification and provision of data requirements of Article VII, paragraph (2) are intended to apply from the moment that a party "plans" to construct an engineering work. That is the plain meaning of the words on the page. It is also clear that the assessment of material
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And this article goes on to provide that the purpose and functions of the Commission are to establish and maintain cooperative arrangements and to promote cooperation between the parties, including, amongst other issues, in respect of facilitating tours of inspection, the purpose of which is "ascertaining the facts connected with those works or sites" on the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it quite clear, in our submission, that the notification and provision of data requirements of Article VII, paragraph (2) are intended to apply from the moment that a party "plans" to construct an engineering work. That is the plain meaning of the words on the page. It is also clear that the assessment of material interference is not a matter that is left to the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And this article goes on to provide that the purpose and functions of the Commission are to establish and maintain cooperative arrangements and to promote cooperation between the parties, including, amongst other issues, in respect of facilitating tours of inspection, the purpose of which is "ascertaining the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it quite clear, in our submission, that the notification and provision of data requirements of Article VII, paragraph (2) are intended to apply from the moment that a party "plans" to construct an engineering work. That is the plain meaning of the words on the page. It is also clear that the assessment of material
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	The first is that the Treaty contains a number of information-sharing provisions. Article VI contains detailed provisions on exchange of data. This is focused largely on the exchange of data relating to the hydrology of rivers and the utilisation of the waters of those rivers. Now Article VI is not directly relevant to the present enquiry, but it is important, as you'll see in just a moment. Article VI also begins to set the tone regarding the Treaty's approach to information-sharing. Article VIII skipping over Article VII for just a moment Article VIII, which addresses the Permanent Indus Commission, provides that the Commission is to serve as the regular channel of communication with respect to, inter alia, the furnishing or exchange of information or data provided for in the Treaty. And this article goes on to provide that the purpose and functions of the Commission are to establish and maintain cooperative arrangements and to promote cooperation between the parties, including, amongst other issues, in respect of facilitating tours of inspection, the purpose of which is "ascertaining the facts connected with those works or sites" on the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	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." Now the reference here to "engineering work which would cause interference with the waters" requires that Article VII, paragraph (2) is read alongside the definition of "interference with the waters" found in Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, to which I took you last week. This provides, as you will recall, that "interference with the waters" means: "(a) Any act of withdrawal [from the waters]; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters" Reading this definition into Article VII(2) makes it quite clear, in our submission, that the notification and provision of data requirements of Article VII, paragraph (2) are intended to apply from the moment that a party "plans" to construct an engineering work. That is the plain meaning of the words on the page. It is also clear that the assessment of material interference is not a matter that is left to the

14:25 1	paragraph of Article VII, paragraph (2), which I haven't	1	the [design] of a HEP establish an obligation on India
2	read to you, but with which you will be familiar.	2	when it selects a site for [the] HEP"; and "If so, what
3	I will come back to the relevance of this in just	3	is that obligation?"; and finally, whether India has
4	a moment.	4	"an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity
5	These information-sharing provisions in the	5	to review [the] site selection more than six months in
6	Treaty Article VI; Article VIII, which deals with the	6	advance of the beginning of construction".
7	role of the Commission; Article VII, which is the	7	As an initial point, I note that Article VII(2) does
8	substantive obligation to notify and share	8	not specify the kind of information that must be shared.
9	information so these information-sharing provisions	9	Nor does it specify the point at which such information
10	in the Treaty itself are supplemented by more detailed	10	must be shared. It is cast in general terms. And
11	and specific exchange of information provisions in the	10	therefore we are quite content to say that we cannot
11	annexures. Now I don't propose to undertake a wider	11	read into Article VII(2), without more, an obligation
12	review across all of the annexures, but you will find	12	upon India to share, for example, site choice
13	information-sharing in a number of the annexures.	13	information. So the language of Article VII(2) does not
14	I propose, just for a moment, to focus on Annexure D.	15	say, "India, thou shalt share site information".
15	Pakistan's Commissioner provided a detailed overview	15	It doesn't do that, and it doesn't address timing.
10	of these information-sharing provisions in Annexure D in	10	This said, I note that Article VII(2) is a hard
18	his written statement and oral evidence; his written	18	obligation. It's not simply a hortatory obligation,
10	statement being at Appendix B to Pakistan's Memorial.	18	an exhortation to provide information. It provides, in
20	As we have seen from his submissions and from your	20	its black letter, that a party:
20	review of Annexure D, Part 3 of Annexure D contains	20	" shall notify the other Party of its plans and
21	detailed provisions regarding the communication of	21 22	shall supply such data relating to the work as may be
22	information. For present purposes, the provisions of	22	available and as would enable the other Party to inform
23	paragraph 9 of Annexure D is the most important. This,	23	itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work."
24	you will recall, provides that:	24 25	The second sentence of Article VII(2) similarly
25	you will recail, provides that.	23	The second sentence of Article VII(2) similarly
	Page 13		Page 15
14.26 1	" India shall at least six months in advance of	14:30 1	nrovides that:
14:26 1	" India shall, at least six months in advance of the beginning of construction of river works connected	14:30 1	provides that:
2	the beginning of construction of river works connected	2	" the Party planning the work shall, on request,
2 3	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the	2 3	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the
2 3 4	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure."	2 3 4	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be
2 3 4 5	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday,	2 3 4 5	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available."
2 3 4 5 6	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of	2 3 4 5 6	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can
2 3 4 5 6 7	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the	2 3 4 5 6 7	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 " the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 " the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 " the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 " the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 " the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 " the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have. So with these provisions in mind, I come to your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work", the clear linkage between these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have. So with these provisions in mind, I come to your questions 3, 4(a) and 4(d). And just to summarise them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work", the clear linkage between these three elements necessarily implies that the notification
$ \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 beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have. So with these provisions in mind, I come to your questions 3, 4(a) and 4(d). And just to summarise them without going through the transcript references, these	$ \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 Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work", the clear linkage between these three elements necessarily implies that the notification and provision of information must be timely to enable
$ \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 beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have. So with these provisions in mind, I come to your questions 3, 4(a) and 4(d). And just to summarise them without going through the transcript references, these ask: "When specifically in the planning stage does [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 Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work", the clear linkage between these three elements necessarily implies that the notification and provision of information must be timely to enable the specified objectives in the article to be achieved.
$ \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 beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have. So with these provisions in mind, I come to your questions 3, 4(a) and 4(d). And just to summarise them without going through the transcript references, these ask: "When specifically in the planning stage does [the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2)]	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work", the clear linkage between these three elements necessarily implies that the notification and provision of information must be timely to enable the specified objectives in the article to be achieved. And I will come back to this to try and make it a little
$ \begin{array}{c} 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 beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have. So with these provisions in mind, I come to your questions 3, 4(a) and 4(d). And just to summarise them without going through the transcript references, these ask: "When specifically in the planning stage does [the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2)] crystallize and what categories of information must 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} $	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work", the clear linkage between these three elements necessarily implies that the notification and provision of information must be timely to enable the specified objectives in the article to be achieved. And I will come back to this to try and make it a little bit more specific 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 beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have. So with these provisions in mind, I come to your questions 3, 4(a) and 4(d). And just to summarise them without going through the transcript references, these ask: "When specifically in the planning stage does [the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2)] crystallize and what categories of information must be exchanged to make the notification process meaningful?"; 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\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 Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work", the clear linkage between these three elements necessarily implies that the notification and provision of information must be timely to enable the specified objectives in the article to be achieved. And I will come back to this to try and make it a little bit more specific in just a moment. Now, the Annexure D, paragraph 9 and Appendix II
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\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 beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information. And the purpose of this information-sharing requirement is that it is intended to provide information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have. So with these provisions in mind, I come to your questions 3, 4(a) and 4(d). And just to summarise them without going through the transcript references, these ask: "When specifically in the planning stage does [the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2)] crystallize and what categories of information must 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} $	" the Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work", the clear linkage between these three elements necessarily implies that the notification and provision of information must be timely to enable the specified objectives in the article to be achieved. And I will come back to this to try and make it a little bit more specific 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\\23\\24\end{array} $	 the beginning of construction of river works connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in writing, the information specified in Appendix II to this Annexure." And as Mr Shah addressed in his evidence on Monday, Appendix II of Annexure D addresses five categories of information that must be provided at this point, at the paragraph 9 point, at least six months before the beginning of construction of river works. And those five categories of information are: first of all, location of the plant; second, hydrologic data; third, hydraulic data; fourth, particulars of design; and fifth, other general information that will afford Pakistan an opportunity to review and to raise any objections that it may have. So with these provisions in mind, I come to your questions 3, 4(a) and 4(d). And just to summarise them without going through the transcript references, these ask: "When specifically in the planning stage does [the information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2)] crystallize and what categories of information must be exchanged to make the notification process meaningful?"; 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\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 Party planning the work shall, on request, supply the other Party with such data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work as may be available." So this is not, therefore, a provision that can simply be dismissed or disregarded as non-substantive. And as regards timing, although Article VII(2) does not specify precisely when such information must be provided, the clear linkage, we say, between a party formulating plans to construct engineering works "which would cause [or be likely to cause] interference with the waters", that's the first element; the second element, the notification of this development and the provision of relevant information; and then the third element, that the purpose of this is to "enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work", the clear linkage between these three elements necessarily implies that the notification and provision of information must be timely to enable the specified objectives in the article to be achieved. And I will come back to this to try and make it a little bit more specific in just a moment. Now, the Annexure D, paragraph 9 and Appendix II

14:31 1	terms of the information that must be provided, and in	14:35 1	information-sharing obligation under Article VII(2)]
2	terms of the purpose of the information exchanged. It	2	crystallize and what categories of information must be
3	must be provided "at least six months in advance of the	3	exchanged to make the notification process meaningful?"
4	beginning of construction of river works connected with	4	In Pakistan's view, this specifically requires India
5	the Plant"; the information must be the information that	5	to supply Pakistan with information on works which would
6	is specified in Appendix II; and the information must be	6	interfere with the waters and would materially affect
7	provided for purposes of enabling Pakistan to evaluate	7	Pakistan. There can be no doubt whatever that the
8	the information, and make any objection that it	8	planning of a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers
9	considers may be warranted. So it's more specific in	9	falls into this category.
10	all of the details, by contrast with Article VII(2).	10	And it requires that that information is provided at
11	Relevant to your questions, the very first category	11	the point at which India arrives at the position or must
12	of information required by Appendix II is a "General map	12	reasonably be deemed to have arrived at the position,
13	showing the location of the site", and related	13	taking into account good faith so it's not just when
14	information. And having regard to this provision,	14	India says it arrives at the position, but must
15	Pakistan anticipates that, were India to have been here	15	reasonably be deemed to have arrived at the position
16	for this hearing, that India's position would have been	16	that it "plans to construct" that's the language of
17	to say that the fact that location information is only	17	Article VII(2) "plans to construct" a run-of-river
18	specified to be provided at this point, at the	18	HEP at the particular site. It is at that point that we
19	six months point, implies that such information need not	19	say that the Article VII(2) obligation kicks in.
20	be provided earlier.	20	So what does this mean in practice?
21	Unsurprisingly, Pakistan does not agree with that	21	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, you will recall
22	putative analysis that India might advance, for three	22	that Dr Hayat and Mr Malik's presentation during the
23	reasons.	23	site visit, on 24 April 2024, addressed the different
24	First, we say that that analysis would not just	24	phases involved in HEP design. This was on their
25	circumvent but would entirely obliterate the	25	slide 5. And they observed that the "HEP design usually
	Page 17		Page 19
14.33 1	Article VII(2) obligation If information with that	14.36 1	goes through five phases before construction can
14:33 1 2	Article VII(2) obligation. If information with that kind of specificity only had to be provided six months	14:36 1	goes through five phases before construction can commence." So these are pre-construction phases. And
2	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months	2	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And
		2 3	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to
2 3	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated.	2	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the
2 3 4 5	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)?	2 3 4 5	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study";
2 3 4	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)?It would be obliterated.Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided	2 3 4	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of
2 3 4 5 6	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the	2 3 4 5 6	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)?It would be obliterated.Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction
2 3 4 5 6 7	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)?It would be obliterated.Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide	2 3 4 5 6 7	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide must be linked to a particular site.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering work, a run-of-river HEP, on a given site.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide must be linked to a particular site. Third, India is subject to broader	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering work, a run-of-river HEP, on a given site. But at the point at which India commissions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide must be linked to a particular site. Third, India is subject to broader information-sharing and cooperation arrangements,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering work, a run-of-river HEP, on a given site.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide must be linked to a particular site. Third, India is subject to broader information-sharing and cooperation arrangements, including as regard tours of inspection to enable	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering work, a run-of-river HEP, on a given site. But at the point at which India commissions an engineering design, it is Pakistan's view that its obligation to inform under Article VII, paragraph (2)
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide must be linked to a particular site. Third, India is subject to broader information-sharing and cooperation arrangements, including as regard tours of inspection to enable Pakistan to ascertain "the facts connected 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} $	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering work, a run-of-river HEP, on a given site. But at the point at which India commissions an engineering design, it is Pakistan's view that its obligation to inform under Article VII, paragraph (2) kicks in. By that point, the planning process has moved beyond mere conception to the first stages of implementation. And crucially, at that point it is not
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide must be linked to a particular site. Third, India is subject to broader information-sharing and cooperation arrangements, including as regard tours of inspection to enable Pakistan to ascertain "the facts connected with works or sites on the Rivers".	$ \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} $	 commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering work, a run-of-river HEP, on a given site. But at the point at which India commissions an engineering design, it is Pakistan's view that its obligation to inform under Article VII, paragraph (2) kicks in. By that point, the planning process has moved beyond mere conception to the first stages of implementation. And crucially, at that point it is not too late for the planning to be revisited in the light
$ \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} $	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide must be linked to a particular site. Third, India is subject to broader information-sharing and cooperation arrangements, including as regard tours of inspection to enable Pakistan to ascertain "the facts connected with works or sites on the Rivers". I'm going to join up the dots, I hope, now. So how	$ \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} $	commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering work, a run-of-river HEP, on a given site. But at the point at which India commissions an engineering design, it is Pakistan's view that its obligation to inform under Article VII, paragraph (2) kicks in. By that point, the planning process has moved beyond mere conception to the first stages of implementation. And crucially, at that point it is not
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide must be linked to a particular site. Third, India is subject to broader information-sharing and cooperation arrangements, including as regard tours of inspection to enable Pakistan to ascertain "the facts connected with works or sites on the Rivers". Tim going to join up the dots, I hope, now. So how do we answer your question?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering work, a run-of-river HEP, on a given site. But at the point at which India commissions an engineering design, it is Pakistan's view that its obligation to inform under Article VII, paragraph (2) kicks in. By that point, the planning process has moved beyond mere conception to the first stages of implementation. And crucially, at that point it is not too late for the planning to be revisited in the light
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	kind of specificity only had to be provided six months before, what then is the purpose of Article VII(2)? It would be obliterated. Second, we say that the structure and content of the Appendix II enumeration of information to be provided makes it quite clear that the requirement to provide location information as a part of the Appendix II information exchange is to properly locate geographically the detailed hydrologic, hydraulic, design and general data that must be provided, because otherwise there would be no way of knowing to what that other information related. So the location information in paragraph 1 of Appendix II is essentially to say: all the other information that you are required to provide must be linked to a particular site. Third, India is subject to broader information-sharing and cooperation arrangements, including as regard tours of inspection to enable Pakistan to ascertain "the facts connected with works or sites on the Rivers". The going to join up the dots, I hope, now. So how do we answer your question? Question 3 asks:	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 commence". So these are pre-construction phases. And the five phases that they identified which we take to be entirely uncontroversial are: first of all, the "Project concept"; second, a "Pre-feasibility study"; third, a "Feasibility study"; fourth, the preparation of an "engineering design"; and fifth, the final stage is that of "finali[sing] the project design in conjunction with the contractor". Those are the five stages. Now Pakistan does not consider that India is obliged to provide site information at the point of project conception or at the point of pre-feasibility studies or even at the point of feasibility studies, as at these points we accept that India cannot reasonably be deemed to have formed a "plan" to "construct" an engineering work, a run-of-river HEP, on a given site. But at the point at which India commissions an engineering design, it is Pakistan's view that its obligation to inform under Article VII, paragraph (2) kicks in. By that point, the planning process has moved beyond mere conception to the first stages of implementation. And crucially, at that point it is not too late for the planning to be revisited in the light of concerns that Pakistan may express. It is at the

14:38 1	circulate the design to stakeholders in order to obtain	14:41 1	without influence of such factors as sunk
2	the requisite approvals, but approvals will not yet have	2	costs/additional costs that would accrue at the point of
3	been given. So the process at that point is, if you	3	design at a later stage.
4	like, crossing a design watershed.	4	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note also
5	I refer also to Mr Shah's testimony on Monday in	5	just for purposes of, if you like, providing belt and
6	which he said that sharing of information by India with	6	braces I note that Pakistan's reading of these
7	Pakistan "after completion of the detailed engineering	7	information-sharing obligations under the Treaty also
8	design" would give, in his words:	8	comports with the approach adopted to such obligations
9	" a brighter chance to converge on the designs or	9	as a matter of general international law. You are
10	on the objections raised by Pakistan, rather than giving	10	guided and bound by the Treaty, but general
11	just six months to Pakistan and then expecting that,	11	international law particularly contemporary general
12	Either Pakistan will accept our stance or we will go	12	international law says the same thing, notably with
13	ahead'."	13	regard to situations concerning potential environmental
14	That's transcript Day 1, page 174, lines 12-24.	14	harm.
15	Pakistan considers that this interpretation, the	15	For example, the International Court of Justice, in
16	interpretation that I've just advanced about	16	a judgment handed down in 2010 in the Pulp Mills case
17	Article VII, paragraph (2), is supported by the object	17	between Argentina and Uruguay, addressed
18	and purpose of the Treaty, notably by the	18	information-sharing obligations in the context of
19	information-sharing obligations under Article VII(2),	19	a treaty that addressed environmental issues in
20	and indeed that those under Annexure D are not an end in	20	connection with the construction of pulp mills on the
21	itself: they are the means by which the Treaty seeks to	21	River Uruguay, and it did so in terms that are entirely
22	avoid conflicts between the parties. It furthers, in	22	consistent with Pakistan's submission in respect of the
23	other words, in the words of the preamble to the Treaty,	23	information-sharing obligations under the Treaty.
24	the goal of settling "in a cooperative spirit all	24	Now I note this is perhaps our oversight; maybe
25	such questions as may hereafter arise".	25	we didn't think that we'd be getting to this point
	Page 21		Page 23
14:40 1	This sharing of information is also the means by	14:43 1	but I note that the Pulp Mills judgment is not on the
14:40 1 2	This sharing of information is also the means by which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy	14:43 1 2	but I note that the Pulp Mills judgment is not on the record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly
2	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy	2	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly
2 3	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are	2 3	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed
2 3 4	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the	2 3 4	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial
2 3 4 5	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is	2 3 4 5	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference.
2 3 4 5 6	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling	2 3 4 5 6	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information
2 3 4 5 6 7	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the appointment and mobilisation of a specific contractor;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third, a study of alternatives of various designs of the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the appointment and mobilisation of a specific contractor; the commencement and completion of preliminary works,	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third, a study of alternatives of various designs of the project on the basis of soundness and economy and other
$ \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} $	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the appointment and mobilisation of a specific contractor; the commencement and completion of preliminary works, such as the construction of access roads; 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} $	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third, a study of alternatives of various designs of the project on the basis of soundness and economy and other regulatory requirements. Without that bare minimum 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} $	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the appointment and mobilisation of a specific contractor; the commencement and completion of preliminary works, such as the construction of access roads; the development of stockpiles, and so on. This, once 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\end{array} $	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third, a study of alternatives of various designs of the project on the basis of soundness and economy and other regulatory requirements. Without that bare minimum of information, Pakistan is not going to be in a position
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the appointment and mobilisation of a specific contractor; the commencement and completion of preliminary works, such as the construction of access roads; the development of stockpiles, and so on. This, once again, is addressed in Mr Shah's witness statement: that's	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third, a study of alternatives of various designs of the project on the basis of soundness and economy and other regulatory requirements. Without that bare minimum of information, Pakistan is not going to be in a position to undertake the evaluation that it is entitled to make
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the appointment and mobilisation of a specific contractor; the commencement and completion of preliminary works, such as the construction of access roads; the development of stockpiles, and so on. This, once again, is addressed in Mr Shah's witness statement: that's PER-1 at paragraph 79. And it would therefore also	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third, a study of alternatives of various designs of the project on the basis of soundness and economy and other regulatory requirements. Without that bare minimum of information, Pakistan is not going to be in a position to undertake the evaluation that it is entitled to make under Article VII, 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\\22\\23\end{array} $	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the appointment and mobilisation of a specific contractor; the commencement and completion of preliminary works, such as the construction of access roads; the development of stockpiles, and so on. This, once again, is addressed in Mr Shah's witness statement: that's	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third, a study of alternatives of various designs of the project on the basis of soundness and economy and other regulatory requirements. Without that bare minimum of information, Pakistan is not going to be in a position to undertake the evaluation that it is entitled to make
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the appointment and mobilisation of a specific contractor; the commencement and completion of preliminary works, such as the construction of access roads; the development of stockpiles, and so on. This, once again, is addressed in Mr Shah's witness statement: that's PER-1 at paragraph 79. And it would therefore also facilitate good faith engagement 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} $	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third, a study of alternatives of various designs of the project on the basis of soundness and economy and other regulatory requirements. Without that bare minimum of information, Pakistan is not going to be in a position to undertake the evaluation that it is entitled to make under Article VII, paragraph (2). So with this, I come to a number of briefer
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	which the Treaty allows the parties to satisfy themselves that the obligations of the other party are being met. The exchange of information, and the consideration of the views of the other party that it is intended to facilitate, has the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made to plans for projected works so that both parties are satisfied that the works are compatible with the Treaty. Now we go beyond just the object and purpose of the Treaty and we say that Pakistan's reading is also supported by the principle of effectiveness that must inform the interpretation and application of the Treaty. The provisions of information at the stage of completion of the detailed engineering design would give the parties an opportunity to endeavour to reach agreement that India's Western run-of-river HEPs will not fall foul of Annexure D far in advance of, for example, the appointment and mobilisation of a specific contractor; the commencement and completion of preliminary works, such as the construction of access roads; the development of stockpiles, and so on. This, once again, is addressed in Mr Shah's witness statement: that's PER-1 at paragraph 79. And it would therefore also	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	record of this case. It is, of course, a publicly available award; and significantly, it is addressed expressly in paragraph 450 of the Kishenganga partial award. So you have that reference. So this brings me to the issue of the information that is required to be exchanged. To make the exchange of information meaningful this is the exchange of information under Article VII, paragraph (2) Pakistan considers that, at a very minimum, the information that must be exchanged, passed from India to Pakistan, at the point when the plan to construct reaches the engineering design phase, must, at a minimum, include: first of all, the intended location of the site of the plant without that, it's not useful second, the detailed engineering design, in the form of what's often described in Indian industry parlance, "the detailed project report"; and third, a study of alternatives of various designs of the project on the basis of soundness and economy and other regulatory requirements. Without that bare minimum of information, Pakistan is not going to be in a position to undertake the evaluation that it is entitled to make under Article VII, paragraph (2).

r		1	
14.44 1	- b -system in managements quantized $A(a)$ and $A(d)$	14:48 1	expressly addressed by the Kishenganga Court in its
14:44 1	observations in response to questions $4(a)$ and $4(d)$.		
2	Question 4(a) asks whether "the constraints that	2	decision on India's request for clarification or
3	exist in the Treaty for the design of a HEP establish	3	interpretation at paragraphs 33 and 34.
4	an obligation on India when it selects a site for	4	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this brings me to
5	a HEP"; and "If so, what [are those] obligation[s]?"	5	your question 6, by which you asked whether India had
6	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I hope it follows	6	acted in compliance with the Kishenganga Court's partial
7	from what I've said already, and what we said in the	7	award and final award.
8	first round, that Pakistan does indeed consider that	8	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. Since you're moving
9	India is under an obligation when it comes to site	9	on to another issue now, I thought I would just pause
10	selection. India has an overriding obligation to comply	10	and see if there are any questions by the members
11	with the Treaty, with its obligations under the Treaty.	11	regarding the information-sharing issues that you've
12	It is required, therefore, to select a site that will	12	just discussed.
13	enable it to meet its Treaty commitments. The corollary	13	In that case, I have a couple of questions I'd like
14	of this is that India is precluded from choosing a site	14	to put to you about it.
15	that would necessarily lead to a breach of its	15	So first of all, in terms of the meaning of the
16	obligations under the Treaty.	16	Article VII(2) obligation, I take it that you would
17	Further, as Professor Webb stated in her	17	agree that, on timing issues, whatever is happening has
18	observations, India cannot, through its choice of site,	18	to happen earlier than six months before construction?
19	manufacture circumstances for purposes of enabling it to	19	SIR DANIEL: Yes.
20	advance a necessity argument when it comes to its	20	THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear you say that, but it seemed to
21	compliance with its obligations under, for example,	21	follow from what you said, and perhaps the text gives us
22	paragraph 8(d) of Annexure D.	22	a little bit of insight in that regard.
23	As to the content of the obligations with regard to	23	On the issue of scope of what well, "scope" may
24	site selection, it may be simply stated as an obligation	24	be the wrong word. On the issue of at what point in the
25	to select a site that will enable India to comply with	25	planning process the obligation crystallises, if I heard
	Page 25		Page 27
	C		Ũ
14.46 1	in The description	14.40 1	
14:46 1	its Treaty obligations.	14:49 1	you correctly, it's at the point where India commissions
2	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India	2	an engineering design.
2 3	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with	23	an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes.
2 3 4	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than	2 3 4	an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is
2 3 4 5	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction".	2 3 4 5	an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are
2 3 4 5 6	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has	2 3 4 5 6	an engineering design.SIR DANIEL: Yes.THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing
2 3 4 5 6 7	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock.	2 3 4 5 6 7	an engineering design.SIR DANIEL: Yes.THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VIII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VIII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VIII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VIII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VIII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under Article VII(2) and then Pakistan requests a tour of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties. As I recall, I also drew attention to the fact that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under Article VII(2) and then Pakistan requests a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d). So the confluence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties. As I recall, I also drew attention to the fact that in a number of instances, Pakistan finds itself
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under Article VII(2) and then Pakistan requests a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d). So the confluence of those two provisions: India's obligation to provide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties. As I recall, I also drew attention to the fact that in a number of instances, Pakistan finds itself discovering India's intent by reference to press reports
$ \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 brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VIII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under Article VII(2) and then Pakistan requests a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d). So the confluence of those two provisions: India's obligation to provide information when its plan to construct is crystallised	$ \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 engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties. As I recall, I also drew attention to the fact that in a number of instances, Pakistan finds itself discovering India's intent by reference to press reports or other public information. This was the case with
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under Article VII(2) and then Pakistan requests a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d). So the confluence of those two provisions: India's obligation to provide information when its plan to construct is crystallised at the point of engineering design; and Pakistan's right	$ \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 engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties. As I recall, I also drew attention to the fact that in a number of instances, Pakistan finds itself discovering India's intent by reference to press reports or other public information. This was the case with regards to the Kishenganga plant, I think, initially
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under Article VII(2) and then Pakistan requests a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d). So the confluence of those two provisions: India's obligation to provide information when its plan to construct is crystallised at the point of engineering design; and Pakistan's right to require a tour of inspection under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties. As I recall, I also drew attention to the fact that in a number of instances, Pakistan finds itself discovering India's intent by reference to press reports or other public information. This was the case with regards to the Kishenganga plant, I think, initially back in 1988.
$ \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 brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under Article VII(2) and then Pakistan requests a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d). So the confluence of those two provisions: India's obligation to provide information when its plan to construct is crystallised at the point of engineering design; and Pakistan's right to require a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(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} $	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties. As I recall, I also drew attention to the fact that in a number of instances, Pakistan finds itself discovering India's intent by reference to press reports or other public information. This was the case with regards to the Kishenganga plant, I think, initially back in 1988. Were the Treaty to be working well, I think 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\\23\\24\end{array} $	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under Article VII(2) and then Pakistan requests a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d). So the confluence of those two provisions: India's obligation to provide information when its plan to construct is crystallised at the point of engineering design; and Pakistan's right to require a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d). To conclude on this point, Mr Chairman, members of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties. As I recall, I also drew attention to the fact that in a number of instances, Pakistan finds itself discovering India's intent by reference to press reports or other public information. This was the case with regards to the Kishenganga plant, I think, initially back in 1988. Were the Treaty to be working well, I think our position would be that when India is beginning 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} $	This brings me to question 4(d), on whether India has "an obligation to provide Pakistan [with an] opportunity to review its site selection more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction". And you'll recall that paragraph 9 of Annexure D has that "six months" clock. This point has already been addressed in my observations under Article VII(2). But just to draw two threads together here, the interaction between the Article VII(2) information-sharing obligation and the Article VII(4)(d) tour of inspection obligation requires India to allow Pakistan to review site selections more than six months in advance of the beginning of construction, as early as the point at which India provides the information required under Article VII(2) and then Pakistan requests a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d). So the confluence of those two provisions: India's obligation to provide information when its plan to construct is crystallised at the point of engineering design; and Pakistan's right to require a tour of inspection under Article VIII(4)(d).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that at that point there is a particular site that has been identified. So you are not arguing that the Article VII(2) information-sharing is necessarily triggered when more than one site is being contemplated, before India settles on a particular location. Is that correct? SIR DANIEL: I suppose, Mr Chairman, we are trying to be reasonable and sensible in our approach to this. And I think as I mentioned on Friday, when, if I recall correctly, you took me to these points again, I identified that really Article VII(2) is going to work better when there in fact is a cooperative spirit between the parties. As I recall, I also drew attention to the fact that in a number of instances, Pakistan finds itself discovering India's intent by reference to press reports or other public information. This was the case with regards to the Kishenganga plant, I think, initially back in 1988. Were the Treaty to be working well, I think our position would be that when India is beginning to

14:51	1	"We're looking at sites along the Kishenganga-Neelum	14:54 1	a study of alternatives of various designs of the
14.51	2	River or along the Jhelum or along the Chenab. This is	14.54 1	
	2	obviously also going to have potential implications	3	
	4	downstream. Let's approach this cooperatively". Now so	4	So I think our expectation is that when it comes to
	4 5	far, that hasn't happened, or at least it hasn't	5	the Article VII information and India must be deemed to
	6	happened since 1992.	6	
	7	We are also mindful that India must have a latitude	7	
	8	to explore and consider and rule out for itself, so it	8	-
	9	may not be appropriate for Pakistan to be brought in	8	*
	10	right, for example, at the pre-feasibility point. And	10	•
	10	we are driven, I have to say, by the text of what	10	_
	12	Article VII(2) says. It says:	11	
	12	"If either Party plans to construct any engineering	12	
	13	work"	13	-
	14	And as we have considered it, in the light of the	15	
	16	five stages before one gets to construction, it seemed	15	
	10	to us that "plan[ning] to construct" crystallises at the	10	
	18	point where India has moved beyond feasibility, where	18	
	19	it may, of its own motion, simply have ruled out various	10	
	20	sites, to the point of engineering design.	20	
	20	Now I'm perfectly willing to accept and indeed,	20	* *
	22	I think this was the tenor of my submissions on	21	
	23	Friday that it may very well be that at the	22	· · · ·
	24	feasibility stage, or even perhaps at the	23	
	25	pre-feasibility stage, if, if you like, within India's	25	
	20		20	
		Page 29		Page 31
14:53	1	planning this becomes a done deal, then that's the point	14:55 1	a policy directive that in a particular region, there is
14:53	1 2	planning this becomes a done deal, then that's the point at which India needs to consult.	14:55 1 2	a policy directive that in a particular region, there is a political decision that a site will go there
14:53				a political decision that a site will go there
14:53	2	at which India needs to consult.	2	
14:53	2 3	at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct.	2 3	a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us.
14:53	2 3 4	at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question	2 3 4	a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say
14:53	2 3 4 5	at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was,	2 3 4 5	a political decision that a site will go thereregardless. At that point, India needs to come to us.THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you saythat basically the point in time when the information is
14:53	2 3 4 5 6	at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward	2 3 4 5 6	a political decision that a site will go thereregardless. At that point, India needs to come to us.THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you saythat basically the point in time when the information isrequired under the Article VII(2) approach is when India
14:53	2 3 4 5 6 7	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, 	2 3 4 5 6 7	a political decision that a site will go thereregardless. At that point, India needs to come to us.THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you saythat basically the point in time when the information isrequired under the Article VII(2) approach is when Indiacommissions an engineering design.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report".
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design?
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where there's possibilities to happen. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being insufficiently precise there. And maybe it's just
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where there's possibilities to happen. SIR DANIEL: No, I think, Mr Chairman, the answer to your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being insufficiently precise there. And maybe it's just a question of how the Indian engineering and design
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where there's possibilities to happen. SIR DANIEL: No, I think, Mr Chairman, the answer to your question actually perhaps lies in what we've identified 	$ \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 political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being insufficiently precise there. And maybe it's just a question of how the Indian engineering and design process will be undertaken.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where there's possibilities to happen. SIR DANIEL: No, I think, Mr Chairman, the answer to your question actually perhaps lies in what we've identified as the information that must be provided at that point. 	$ \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 political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being insufficiently precise there. And maybe it's just a question of how the Indian engineering and design process will be undertaken. It can't, self-evidently, be at the point at which
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where there's possibilities to happen. SIR DANIEL: No, I think, Mr Chairman, the answer to your question actually perhaps lies in what we've identified as the information that must be provided at that point. Because you'll recall that I identified three categories 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being insufficiently precise there. And maybe it's just a question of how the Indian engineering and design process will be undertaken. It can't, self-evidently, be at the point at which the engineering design is complete, done and dusted,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where there's possibilities to happen. SIR DANIEL: No, I think, Mr Chairman, the answer to your question actually perhaps lies in what we've identified as the information that must be provided at that point. Because you'll recall that I identified three categories of information: one was the intended location of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being insufficiently precise there. And maybe it's just a question of how the Indian engineering and design process will be undertaken. It can't, self-evidently, be at the point at which the engineering design is complete, done and dusted, blessed, and the next stage is construction works,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where there's possibilities to happen. SIR DANIEL: No, I think, Mr Chairman, the answer to your question actually perhaps lies in what we've identified as the information that must be provided at that point. Because you'll recall that I identified three categories of information: one was the intended location of the site; second was the detailed engineering design, in the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being insufficiently precise there. And maybe it's just a question of how the Indian engineering and design process will be undertaken. It can't, self-evidently, be at the point at which the engineering design is complete, done and dusted, blessed, and the next stage is construction works, because that would effectively take it into the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where there's possibilities to happen. SIR DANIEL: No, I think, Mr Chairman, the answer to your question actually perhaps lies in what we've identified as the information that must be provided at that point. Because you'll recall that I identified three categories of information: one was the intended location of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being insufficiently precise there. And maybe it's just a question of how the Indian engineering and design process will be undertaken. It can't, self-evidently, be at the point at which the engineering design is complete, done and dusted, blessed, and the next stage is construction works,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 at which India needs to consult. So it's when the party plans to construct. THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the reason why I asked the question was: in the midst of last week's submissions, there was, on more than one occasion, the proposition put forward that: at a particular site, India might say, "Well, because of this particular location, we need to do a low-level outlet", to which I thought I saw Pakistan representing to us, "Well, what if there's a site upriver that could be used, a smaller dam and no need for the outlet?" If that's the kind of conversation that needs to happen, can that happen in the context of what you've just presented to us? It may be it can. Maybe I'm conceiving of the "site" as being a bit too narrow, and that actually it can be a stretch of the river where there's possibilities to happen. SIR DANIEL: No, I think, Mr Chairman, the answer to your question actually perhaps lies in what we've identified as the information that must be provided at that point. Because you'll recall that I identified three categories of information: one was the intended location of the site; second was the detailed engineering design, in the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 a political decision that a site will go there regardless. At that point, India needs to come to us. THE CHAIRMAN: So last question: I thought I heard you say that basically the point in time when the information is required under the Article VII(2) approach is when India commissions an engineering design. SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But then I thought I heard you say that the information to be exchanged at that point is a detailed engineering design, also known as a "detailed project report". So I was a little bit confused. Are you saying the engineering design has been commissioned and produced, that's the point in time, as opposed to when you are about to develop the design? SIR DANIEL: I think probably, Mr Chairman, I was being insufficiently precise there. And maybe it's just a question of how the Indian engineering and design process will be undertaken. It can't, self-evidently, be at the point at which the engineering design is complete, done and dusted, blessed, and the next stage is construction works, because that would effectively take it into the

14:57	1 too early to do it at the point at which a Ministry of	1	demonstratives that you now have.
	2 Water Resources official says, "Well, we must now	2	Just by way of framing this, the KHEP was reportedly
	3 commission an engineering design".	3	commissioned on 19 August 2018, when Indian Prime
	4 And I think the language then comes back to	4	Minister Narendra Modi inaugurated the project.
	5 Article VII(2), which says India:	5	There are two key issues concerning India's
	 6 " shall supply such data relating to the work as 	6	compliance with the Kishenganga Court's awards and
	 may be available and as would enable the other Party to 	0 7	decisions that we need to consider. The first is
	 inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the 	8	India's compliance with the Court's prohibition on
	9 work."	8 9	drawdown flushing, which is addressed in its partial
	0 And it may be and indeed it should be that	10	award I think it's Decision paragraphs B in the
	 And it may be and indeed it should be that this provision of information requirement is not simply 	10	Partial Award and also in its Decision on
	2 a one-shot exercise: India provides all the information	11	Clarification. The second is India's compliance with
	3 as it has available, and then next week it has more	12	the minimum flow/environmental flow requirements, which
	 4 information, but it says, "Well, we've already provided 	13	are addressed in the Court's Final Award in Decision
	5 you with information".	14	paragraphs A.
	6 So it's going to be at some reasonable point,	15	Let me deal with the issue of drawdown flushing
	 I think, along that engineering design continuum. It 	10	first, because I can deal with that more quickly. The
	8 may not be the very first moment, it certainly won't be	18	only thing I can say at this point is the following.
	9 the very last moment, but it's going to be somewhere	18	From Pakistan's downstream monitoring, Pakistan has
	where that information becomes available and useful to	20	not detected that India has so far undertaken any
	the other party.	20	drawdown flushing, any empty flushing of the KHEP.
	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that's fine. I'm just bearing in mind	21	Whether India wishes to keep open this possibility is
	your hope that we'll be relatively granular in our	22	not clear. But what is evident is that India is
	you hope that we hoe relatively granular in our	23	undertaking drawdown flushing of its Western River HEPs,
	25 SIR DANIEL: Yes.	24	in contravention of the Kishenganga partial award. And
-		25	in contravention of the residenging a partial award. This
	Page 33		Page 35
14:58	e	15:01 1	the clearest example of this is India's recent flushing
	2 know if you have a particular view on where in the	-	
		2	of Salal, to which Mr Shah referred in his evidence,
	3 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer	3	which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that
	continuum that might reside. You don't need to answerit now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as	3 4	which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of
:	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. 	3 4 5	which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty.
	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy 	3 4 5 6	which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP,
	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But 	3 4 5 6 7	which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty.It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level,
	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, 	3 4 5 6 7 8	which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing,
	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is
1	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head.
1	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow
1	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award.
1 1 1 1	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that
1 1 1 1 1	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required
1 1 1 1 1 1	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and I don't feel overly stressed about that aspect. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need to balance power generation with environmental and other
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and I don't feel overly stressed about that aspect. So this brings me to your question 6, by which you 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need to balance power generation with environmental and other downstream uses. And that is when the inflow of the dam
	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and I don't feel overly stressed about that aspect. So this brings me to your question 6, by which you ask whether India has "acted in compliance with the 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need to balance power generation with environmental and other downstream uses. And that is when the inflow of the dam site meets or exceeds this magnitude. If the inflow at
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and I don't feel overly stressed about that aspect. So this brings me to your question 6, by which you ask whether India has "acted in compliance with the Kishenganga Court's Partial and Final Awards as they 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need to balance power generation with environmental and other downstream uses. And that is when the inflow of the dam site meets or exceeds this magnitude. If the inflow at the dam site is less than 9 cumecs, India is required to
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and I don't feel overly stressed about that aspect. So this brings me to your question 6, by which you ask whether India has "acted in compliance with the Kishenganga Court's Partial and Final Awards as they relate to the KHEP". And you will find elements of this 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need to balance power generation with environmental and other downstream uses. And that is when the inflow of the dam site meets or exceeds this magnitude. If the inflow at the dam site is less than 9 cumecs, India is required to release 100% of the inflow downstream of the dam.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and I don't feel overly stressed about that aspect. So this brings me to your question 6, by which you ask whether India has "acted in compliance with the Kishenganga Court's Partial and Final Awards as they relate to the KHEP". And you will find elements of this addressed in Mr Shah's testimony at transcript Day 1, 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need to balance power generation with environmental and other downstream uses. And that is when the inflow of the dam site meets or exceeds this magnitude. If the inflow at the dam site is less than 9 cumecs, India is required to release 100% of the inflow downstream of the dam. Now if we may have the screen, please. Could we
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and I don't feel overly stressed about that aspect. So this brings me to your question 6, by which you ask whether India has "acted in compliance with the Kishenganga Court's Partial and Final Awards as they relate to the KHEP". And you will find elements of this addressed in Mr Shah's testimony at transcript Day 1, page 185, lines 2-19. But let me give you a rather 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need to balance power generation with environmental and other downstream uses. And that is when the inflow of the dam site meets or exceeds this magnitude. If the inflow at the dam site is less than 9 cumecs, India is required to release 100% of the inflow downstream of the dam. Now if we may have the screen, please. Could we turn the screen on, please, for exhibits? Thank you.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and I don't feel overly stressed about that aspect. So this brings me to your question 6, by which you ask whether India has "acted in compliance with the Kishenganga Court's Partial and Final Awards as they relate to the KHEP". And you will find elements of this addressed in Mr Shah's testimony at transcript Day 1, 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need to balance power generation with environmental and other downstream uses. And that is when the inflow of the dam site meets or exceeds this magnitude. If the inflow at the dam site is less than 9 cumecs, India is required to release 100% of the inflow downstream of the dam. Now if we may have the screen, please. Could we
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 continuum that might reside. You don't need to answer it now; tomorrow would be fine. Or you just leave it as it is, and leave it to the Court to consider. SIR DANIEL: We will think about that further. We are happy in principle, of course, to leave it to the Court. But if there's further guidance that we can give on that, we'll come back and do that tomorrow. So that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Please proceed whenever you're ready. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I note that I immediately have been in breach of my own time limits, as we're almost approaching the hour and I've got a little way to go. But as I say, we've got time, and I don't feel overly stressed about that aspect. So this brings me to your question 6, by which you ask whether India has "acted in compliance with the Kishenganga Court's Partial and Final Awards as they relate to the KHEP". And you will find elements of this addressed in Mr Shah's testimony at transcript Day 1, page 185, lines 2-19. But let me give you a rather fuller response, because we do have a fuller response to 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which was plainly in breach of the 1978 agreement, that agreement having been concluded under the framework of the Treaty. It is also clear that India's design of the KHEP, with orifice spillways below the dead storage level, would enable India to undertake drawdown flushing, should it choose to do so. So the sword of Damocles is hanging over Pakistan's head. So I then turn to the issue of the minimum flow ordered by the Kishenganga Court in its final award. This is at Decision paragraphs A(1) and (2) of that final award. And by those decisions, India is required to release a minimum of 9 cumecs flow downstream of the dam so that's downstream, 9 cumecs given the need to balance power generation with environmental and other downstream uses. And that is when the inflow of the dam site meets or exceeds this magnitude. If the inflow at the dam site is less than 9 cumecs, India is required to release 100% of the inflow downstream of the dam. Now if we may have the screen, please. Could we turn the screen on, please, for exhibits? Thank you. Megan, perhaps you could just focus on the top

15:03 1	enlarge it, so you focus on the top half of that page?	15:06 1	that the downstream flow from the KHEP across the
2	You now have a number of new exhibits that go to	2	Line of Control was less than 9 cumecs during the period
3	this issue, and notably Exhibits P-642 to P-644. There	3	from October 2021 to March 2022; in August 2022; in
4	are also other documents that were already in the record	4	September to October 2023; and in January 2024. And
5	addressing this issue. The relevant exhibit, P-644, is	5	this is what is shown by the table and the figures in
6	on the screen now, and there is a demonstrative which	6	front of you: the number of hourly instances and
7	I believe you have: something that looks like that	7	corresponding number of days is given in the table; and
8	(indicating), a three-page demonstrative. Has that been	8	the flow is shown in the figure.
9	handed out? I believe it's at tab 17. Yes, okay. So	9	Now, there is some additional information which
10	the demonstrative speaks to the exhibit that's on the	10	India has provided, which you'll see on the
11	screen, and let me take you through the demonstrative.	11	demonstrative but again I won't go through in detail,
12	Pakistan is not in a position to gauge the flow of	12	which is river flow information which is supplied by
13	the Kishenganga-Neelum River at any point on India's	13	India from its own gauging stations. And on the basis
14	side of the Line of Control, either upstream or	14	of India's data, Pakistan has been able to determine
15	downstream. So what Pakistan is able to monitor is	15	that the inflow into the Kishenganga plant was only less
16	limited. The only information available to Pakistan	16	than 9 cumecs on five occasions over the course of the
17	remains that provided by India either under Article VI,	17	period 1 January 2020 to 31 August 2023, which is the
18	paragraph (1), to which I drew your attention earlier,	18	last date on which India provided information.
19	which is the information-sharing in relation to the	19	Taking these together, it shows that in fact there
20	hydrology of the river and the use of the waters; and to	20	have been a considerable number of occasions in which
21	monitor the inflows that enter Pakistan crossing the	21	the flow of the water from the Kishenganga plant has not
22	Line of Control. WAPDA which is Pakistan's Water and	22	complied with the Kishenganga final award.
23	Power Development Authority has a surface-water	23	The PCIW has raised these issues formally with his
24	hydrology project which you'll see referred to in the	24	Indian counterpart in correspondence you'll see that
25	demonstrative, which has located two observation	25	indicated on the demonstrative first of all, dated
	Page 37		Page 39
			8
15:05 1	stations: one along the Neelum River, which is just	15:08 1	17 June 2022, at Exhibit P-217, and 8 September 2022,
15:05 1 2	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is	15:08 1 2	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on
	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that,		P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the
2 3 4	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to	2 3 4	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022.
2 3 4 5	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters	2 3	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence
2 3 4 5 6	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the	2 3 4 5 6	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his
2 3 4 5 6 7	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan.	2 3 4 5 6 7	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the river, immediately after it crosses the Line of Control	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to verify the release of minimum environmental flows in
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the river, immediately after it crosses the Line of Control from the Indian side, is in accordance with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to verify the release of minimum environmental flows in accordance with the Kishenganga final award. And I will
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the river, immediately after it crosses the Line of Control from the Indian side, is in accordance with the Kishenganga final award; that's Decision A(1). The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to verify the release of minimum environmental flows in accordance with the Kishenganga final award. And I will simply identify for you but they're all on the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the river, immediately after it crosses the Line of Control from the Indian side, is in accordance with the Kishenganga final award; that's Decision A(1). The frequency of the data that Pakistan collects is hourly	$ \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} $	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to verify the release of minimum environmental flows in accordance with the Kishenganga final award. And I will simply identify for you but they're all on the demonstrative various of the exhibits: 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 little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the river, immediately after it crosses the Line of Control from the Indian side, is in accordance with the Kishenganga final award; that's Decision A(1). The frequency of the data that Pakistan collects is hourly data. And since 1 November 2018 until 9 July 2024	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to verify the release of minimum environmental flows in accordance with the Kishenganga final award. And I will simply identify for you but they're all on the demonstrative various of the exhibits: that's Exhibits P-188, P-202, P-203, P-208, P-209, P-210,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the river, immediately after it crosses the Line of Control from the Indian side, is in accordance with the Kishenganga final award; that's Decision A(1). The frequency of the data that Pakistan collects is hourly data. And since 1 November 2018 until 9 July 2024 that's just a few days ago WAPDA has collected	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to verify the release of minimum environmental flows in accordance with the Kishenganga final award. And I will simply identify for you but they're all on the demonstrative various of the exhibits: that's Exhibits P-188, P-202, P-203, P-208, P-209, P-210, P-211, P-212, P-213 and P-214. And as you will recall,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the river, immediately after it crosses the Line of Control from the Indian side, is in accordance with the Kishenganga final award; that's Decision A(1). The frequency of the data that Pakistan collects is hourly data. And since 1 November 2018 until 9 July 2024 that's just a few days ago WAPDA has collected 49,872 readings from these gauging stations.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to verify the release of minimum environmental flows in accordance with the Kishenganga final award. And I will simply identify for you but they're all on the demonstrative various of the exhibits: that's Exhibits P-188, P-202, P-203, P-208, P-209, P-210, P-211, P-212, P-213 and P-214. And as you will recall, I'm sure, very clearly from the competence phase, India
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the river, immediately after it crosses the Line of Control from the Indian side, is in accordance with the Kishenganga final award; that's Decision A(1). The frequency of the data that Pakistan collects is hourly data. And since 1 November 2018 until 9 July 2024 that's just a few days ago WAPDA has collected	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to verify the release of minimum environmental flows in accordance with the Kishenganga final award. And I will simply identify for you but they're all on the demonstrative various of the exhibits: that's Exhibits P-188, P-202, P-203, P-208, P-209, P-210, P-211, P-212, P-213 and P-214. And as you will recall,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	a little bit further downstream when the Neelum is flowing fully in Pakistan; and one just above that, along a tributary that flows into the Neelum River, to allow Pakistan to undertake a calculation of what waters of the Neelum River are in fact flowing from the Kishenganga plant into Pakistan. You'll see the detail set out on the demonstrative, and I won't go through all of it closely. But by undertaking a calculation based on these two gauging stations, Pakistan is able to calculate the flows of the Neelum River into Pakistan at the Line of Control. These are automatic gauging stations that have been operational since 1 November 2018, so that's very shortly after the Kishenganga plant became operational. The gauging is specifically for the purpose of monitoring whether or not the quantum of flow into the river, immediately after it crosses the Line of Control from the Indian side, is in accordance with the Kishenganga final award; that's Decision A(1). The frequency of the data that Pakistan collects is hourly data. And since 1 November 2018 until 9 July 2024 that's just a few days ago WAPDA has collected 49,872 readings from these gauging stations.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	P-219; to which the Indian Commissioner responded on 7 October, P-642, in which he asked for the data of the Karimabad and Taobut for the period 2018 to 2022. Although the PCIW provided the data in correspondence dated 18 November 2022, at P-643, and the PCIW urged his Indian counterpart to arrange a site visit that's under Article VIII, paragraph (4)(d) no further response was received from India. So our position is that India has historically, at various points, been in breach of the minimum flow obligations derived from the Kishenganga award. I note also, as a separate but related matter, that the PCIW, in recent years, has emphasised to his Indian counterpart on numerous occasions the importance of an inspection by Pakistan of the arrangements made by India at the Kishenganga dam to enable Pakistan to verify the release of minimum environmental flows in accordance with the Kishenganga final award. And I will simply identify for you but they're all on the demonstrative various of the exhibits: that's Exhibits P-188, P-202, P-203, P-208, P-209, P-210, P-211, P-212, P-213 and P-214. And as you will recall, I'm sure, very clearly from the competence phase, India

15:10	of these ten years or more, but indeed India invariably	15:14 1	THE CHAIRMAN: I highly doubt that, Sir Daniel! (Pause)
	2 did not even bother to reply to the PCIW correspondence.	2	SIR DANIEL: So as I have addressed previously, India is
	With that, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn	3	designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has
	to the issue of weaponisation, which I'm going to be	4	countrywide, not for the 201 that it has constructed or
	able to address very briefly, and I hope I won't detain	5	has planned for the Western Rivers. And it is apparent
	5 you too much longer.	6	to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's
	7 So this brings me to question 13, which you	7	Western Rivers projects are an irritant to India that
	described as the issue of weaponisation. And by this,	8	India would prefer to circumvent, to avoid, or simply to
	 you noted that "Pakistan has expressed a concern 	9	disregard.
1		10	And as I observed as a general matter, and as
1		10	Professor Webb has addressed in the particular, India
1		12	has now for decades been presenting Pakistan with one
1	-	12	largely standard design for its HEPs, and this
1		13	off-the-shelf approach has been the subject of
1	c	15	discussion in PIC meetings.
1		16	And I pause here just to note that it is quite
1		17	significant, we consider, that India has run-of-river
1		18	HEPs on the Eastern Rivers, and the design is exactly
1		10	the same as the run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers.
2	-	20	So it appears to us that when India comes to design for
2		20	the Western Rivers, it's not making any adjustments for
2		22	Treaty purposes, to adjust its Eastern Rivers HEP design
2		22	to cater for the Treaty constraints under the
2		23	Western Rivers.
2		25	Two examples will suffice of where this
_			
	Page 41		Page 43
1		15:15 1	off-the-shelf approach has been the subject of
2	line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11;	2	discussion in PIC meetings.
2	line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17.	2 3	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last
2	line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's	2 3 4	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened
2	line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11;Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17.But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian	2 3 4 5	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it
	line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11;Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17.But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images	2 3 4 5 6	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3
	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in
	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard
	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And
	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the
	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 9 10 1 1 12	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers,
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 11 11	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 14	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 1 1 12 13 14 14 15 10	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and
2 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 19 10 10	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which
	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's Western Rivers 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which Professor Webb also referred to in her slides that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's Western Rivers projects 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which Professor Webb also referred to in her slides that's PHM-12 at slide 20 in which the Pakistan Commissioner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 10 11 11 12 11 14 11 11 12 11 14 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's Western Rivers projects THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment Sir Daniel. I think we should 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which Professor Webb also referred to in her slides that's PHM-12 at slide 20 in which the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters observed that:
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 2	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's Western Rivers projects THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment Sir Daniel. I think we should go ahead and close the windows, unfortunately. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which Professor Webb also referred to in her slides that's PHM-12 at slide 20 in which the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters observed that: " despite the fact that clear guidelines are
22 33 45 66 77 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's Western Rivers projects THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment Sir Daniel. I think we should go ahead and close the windows, unfortunately. SIR DANIEL: I note that previously there was applause, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which Professor Webb also referred to in her slides that's PHM-12 at slide 20 in which the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters observed that: " despite the fact that clear guidelines are provided regarding sediment management in Baglihar and
2 2 3 2 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's Western Rivers projects THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment Sir Daniel. I think we should go ahead and close the windows, unfortunately. SIR DANIEL: I note that previously there was applause, which was attributed to appreciation of Professor Webb's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which Professor Webb also referred to in her slides that's PHM-12 at slide 20 in which the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters observed that: " despite the fact that clear guidelines are provided regarding sediment management in Baglihar and Kishenganga yet India keeps on proposing deep
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 24	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's Western Rivers projects THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment Sir Daniel. I think we should go ahead and close the windows, unfortunately. SIR DANIEL: I note that previously there was applause, which was attributed to appreciation of Professor Webb's submissions. I presume that the noise coming from 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which Professor Webb also referred to in her slides that's PHM-12 at slide 20 in which the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters observed that: " despite the fact that clear guidelines are provided regarding sediment management in Baglihar and Kishenganga yet India keeps on proposing deep orifice spillways in its designs."
2 2 3 2 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 12 13 14 15 16 11 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's Western Rivers projects THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment Sir Daniel. I think we should go ahead and close the windows, unfortunately. SIR DANIEL: I note that previously there was applause, which was attributed to appreciation of Professor Webb's submissions. I presume that the noise coming from 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which Professor Webb also referred to in her slides that's PHM-12 at slide 20 in which the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters observed that: " despite the fact that clear guidelines are provided regarding sediment management in Baglihar and Kishenganga yet India keeps on proposing deep
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 24	 line 19 to page 5, line 4; Day 4, page 221, lines 8-11; Day 5, page 221, lines 7-17. But I note as well on Day 4 that Professor Webb's submissions addressed at some length the "typical Indian HEP design", and this was in conjunction with the images provided on her slides at slides 19, 42, 62 and 63, and this is PHM-12. As this recitation of transcript references indicates, we have already addressed this question in some detail in our first-round submissions, and I am therefore going to confine myself only to one or two brief points of observation. As I have addressed, India is designing for the more than 5,000 large dams that it has in the country, not for the 201 that it has constructed or has planned for the Western Rivers. It is apparent to Pakistan that the Treaty constraints on India's Western Rivers projects THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment Sir Daniel. I think we should go ahead and close the windows, unfortunately. SIR DANIEL: I note that previously there was applause, which was attributed to appreciation of Professor Webb's submissions. I presume that the noise coming from 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	discussion in PIC meetings. The first is the example that I took you to last week, of the 90th meeting of the PIC, which was convened especially to discuss Baglihar. If memory serves me, it was in 2004. This was Exhibit P-544 at paragraphs 6.1.3 and 6.2.3, in which the Indian Commissioner stated in terms that its Baglihar plant design was a standard Indian design, it was "not an exception". And Pakistan's Commissioner then responded noting that the Treaty had placed restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers, and that a standard design that did not take into account India's treaty obligations was not acceptable or not appropriate. The second example is the 111th PIC meeting, and that's at Exhibit P-25 at paragraph 29, which Professor Webb also referred to in her slides that's PHM-12 at slide 20 in which the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters observed that: " despite the fact that clear guidelines are provided regarding sediment management in Baglihar and Kishenganga yet India keeps on proposing deep orifice spillways in its designs."

15:17 1	both motivation and evidence, the two parts of your	15:19 1	the parties could be notified to this effect, including
2	question: a simple disinclination on India's part to	2	on the likely timing of such a preliminary partial
3	observe its Treaty obligations when it comes to	3	award, as this would almost certainly be very relevant
4	Pakistan. It is too bothersome and too burdensome to	4	to the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, elements of
5	India, and India prefers simply to build, build, build	5	the timing of which are in the public domain and on the
6	on the Western Rivers.	6	record of these proceedings.
7	But beyond this is also what Pakistan perceives to	7	And if you do decide to proceed in this manner, you
8	be India's policy imperative of wishing to appropriate	8	may also wish to consider whether it would be necessary
9	more and more of the waters of the Indus Basin. This is	9	or appropriate to your analysis and conclusions on the
10	evident from India's approach to the stopping of the	10	question 35(a) issues for you also to unpack and
11	flow of the Eastern Rivers and its approach towards	11	elaborate on the general duty of mutual respect and
12	maximising the storage of the run-of-river HEPs on the	12	comity which you addressed in PO6, apart from its
13	Western Rivers, in the face of efficient and effective	13	implications for the organisation of the respective
14	design possibilities that would enable India to observe	14	proceedings. This is an immensely important principle
15	its Treaty commitments.	15	and one that would no doubt benefit from further
16	India is doing what many not all, but what many	16	elaboration, including for the benefit of the
17	upper riparians do or want to do: namely, to expropriate	17	Neutral Expert.
18	the water as it passes through the territory under their	18	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that concludes my
19	control. But the very purpose of the Indus Waters	19	opening submissions for today. I will be back tomorrow
20	Treaty was to avoid this by dividing the watersheds.	20	to close Pakistan's case. In the course of that
21	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I come to my	21	closing, I will address a number of the other
22	final very brief observations, which is simply to	22	questions questions 7(a) and (b), question 8 and the
23	address the point, Mr Chairman, that you raised on	23	first part of question 9 and I will also address,
24	whether it would be useful and appropriate for the Court	24	Mr Chairman, your five-step scheme on the sequence for
25	to give a preliminary partial award on the	25	applying sources of law or practice.
	Page 45		Dage 47
	rage 40		Page 47
15:18 1	question 35(a) issues.	15:21 1	I note that we are not quite at the mid-afternoon
15:18 1 2	question 35(a) issues. Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on	15:21 1 2	I note that we are not quite at the mid-afternoon break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your
	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues		break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break
2	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions	2	break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your
2 3	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues	2 3	break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break
2 3 4	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to	2 3 4	break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts.
2 3 4 5	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be	2 3 4 5 6 7	break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against which Pakistan considers the Court would itself be well	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some connection with the weaponisation issue, and I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against which Pakistan considers the Court would itself be well placed to guard. It is simply to say that before	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some connection with the weaponisation issue, and I don't know if it's helpful for you to hear a little bit about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against which Pakistan considers the Court would itself be well placed to guard. It is simply to say that before handing down such a preliminary partial award, the Court	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some connection with the weaponisation issue, and I don't know if it's helpful for you to hear a little bit about that now as you prepare for tomorrow?
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against which Pakistan considers the Court would itself be well placed to guard. It is simply to say that before handing down such a preliminary partial award, the Court would have to reflect with care about the possible	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some connection with the weaponisation issue, and I don't know if it's helpful for you to hear a little bit about that now as you prepare for tomorrow? SIR DANIEL: You mean hear from you some of the concerns
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against which Pakistan considers the Court would itself be well placed to guard. It is simply to say that before handing down such a preliminary partial award, the Court would have to reflect with care about the possible implications of such an award for that part of the case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some connection with the weaponisation issue, and I don't know if it's helpful for you to hear a little bit about that now as you prepare for tomorrow? SIR DANIEL: You mean hear from you some of the concerns that are in the minds of the Court about that?
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against which Pakistan considers the Court would itself be well placed to guard. It is simply to say that before handing down such a preliminary partial award, the Court would have to reflect with care about the possible implications of such an award for that part of the case which still remained to be addressed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some connection with the weaponisation issue, and I don't know if it's helpful for you to hear a little bit about that now as you prepare for tomorrow? SIR DANIEL: You mean hear from you some of the concerns that are in the minds of the Court about that? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against which Pakistan considers the Court would itself be well placed to guard. It is simply to say that before handing down such a preliminary partial award, the Court would have to reflect with care about the possible implications of such an award for that part of the case which still remained to be addressed. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, if the Court does	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some connection with the weaponisation issue, and I don't know if it's helpful for you to hear a little bit about that now as you prepare for tomorrow? SIR DANIEL: You mean hear from you some of the concerns that are in the minds of the Court about that? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. SIR DANIEL: I'd be very happy to do so. If it's possible
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against which Pakistan considers the Court would itself be well placed to guard. It is simply to say that before handing down such a preliminary partial award, the Court would have to reflect with care about the possible implications of such an award for that part of the case which still remained to be addressed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some connection with the weaponisation issue, and I don't know if it's helpful for you to hear a little bit about that now as you prepare for tomorrow? SIR DANIEL: You mean hear from you some of the concerns that are in the minds of the Court about that? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	Pakistan agrees that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful, and that these issues could be readily bifurcated from the remaining questions of which the Court is seised. This said, I note that there may be a fine line to be drawn between the issues that might usefully be addressed in such a preliminary award and deciding at a preliminary stage substantive questions that may be caught up with other matters. There may equally be considerations of whether, in the event that question 35(a) were to be bifurcated and to be the subject of a preliminary award, such an award may warrant a revisiting of questions that have already been addressed in the hearing; and I raised these with you, I think, when you put the point to me last week. But both of these are speculative points, against which Pakistan considers the Court would itself be well placed to guard. It is simply to say that before handing down such a preliminary partial award, the Court would have to reflect with care about the possible implications of such an award for that part of the case which still remained to be addressed. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, if the Court does	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 break, but getting there. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, it may be a good opportunity to take a break now, so that Mr Rae, when he comes to the microphone, will have a clear run, rather than being interrupted ten minutes after he starts. THE CHAIRMAN: We may make our way all the way to the break time with questions for you, Sir Daniel! Let me turn to my colleagues to see if there are any questions from them. If not, I have a couple for you. SIR DANIEL: Just to take us up to the break. THE CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate where, in the presentations to come, the questions relating to the relevance of Annexure E will be addressed? SIR DANIEL: Yes, I'm going to be addressing those in closing tomorrow. THE CHAIRMAN: I raise that because I do think there is some connection with the weaponisation issue, and I don't know if it's helpful for you to hear a little bit about that now as you prepare for tomorrow? SIR DANIEL: You mean hear from you some of the concerns that are in the minds of the Court about that? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. SIR DANIEL: I'd be very happy to do so. If it's possible

		-	
15.00 1		15-05 1	
15:22 1	bandwidth it may be that we will be able to address	15:25 1	on in the Neutral Expert proceedings or to anticipate
2	the Annexure E questions tomorrow morning, rather than	2	how the Neutral Expert might deal with those issues,
3	just in my closing.	3	it seems to us that that is a very important principle
4	I should note that Dr Morris, in his presentation,	4	that would merit unpacking in any event. And insofar as
5	either later today or perhaps now more likely tomorrow	5	the Court has itself tied that general duty to the
6	morning, will also be addressing the questions of	6	conduct both of this Court and of the Neutral Expert,
7	weaponisation that you've asked from an engineering	7	it may be that you consider that further guidance on
8	perspective.	8	that would be helpful.
9	So, Mr Chairman, I'd be obviously very happy to take	9	THE CHAIRMAN: Are you in a position to indicate to the
10	your questions now; you could also save them until	10	Court Pakistan's position as to why the Neutral Expert
11	you've heard Dr Morris. That depends on you, whichever	11	may not be competent in all or in some respects?
12	you think is going to be most efficient.	12	SIR DANIEL: I am not in a position to address in any way
13	THE CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps it's best to hold them until	13	either the detail of our paragraph 7 challenge or the
14	we hear Dr Morris. And perhaps some back-and-forth with	14	detail of India's argument. And I think we have been
15	him hopefully it happens today might give you some	15	not just going up to the line but have been very clear
16	further thoughts for tomorrow.	16	that we stayed on one side of the confidentiality line
17	SIR DANIEL: Thank you.	17	when it comes to those issues.
18	Mr Chairman, just as you speak, two points come to	18	But what I can say is that it is absolutely clear
19	mind. First of all, I expect that it's now very	19	and beyond doubt that the Neutral Expert competence is
20	unlikely that Dr Morris will get on today. But there's	20	defined by two paragraphs in the Treaty.
21	also a possibility which no doubt you can reserve to	21	One is paragraph 11 of Annexure D, which says that
22	yourself, and that is that if you wish, after the close	22	in the event of a I'm not quoting it, just
23	of the hearing today, you may wish to send us some	23	paraphrasing but in the event of a dispute over the
24	further written questions, if you want to crystallise	24	information that's provided in respect of a particular
25	those points a little bit more closely.	25	plant, that matter may be referred to one or other of
	Page 40		Dage 51
	Page 49		Page 51
15:23 1	THE CHAIRMAN: So let me turn now to the issue of the	15:26 1	the dispute settlement mechanisms under Article IX.
2	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be	2	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F,
2 3	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral	23	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral
2 3 4	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as	2 3 4	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the
2 3 4 5	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context?	2 3 4 5	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of
2 3 4 5 6	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from	2 3 4 5 6	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D".
2 3 4 5 6 7	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context?SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings	2 3 4 5 6 7	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context?SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context?SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context?SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website.You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convend again, on the public 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that matter, and then he will obviously deliver his views on 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with a cadence of certain specified dates and a cadence of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that matter, and then he will obviously deliver his views on that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with a cadence of certain specified dates.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that matter, and then he will obviously deliver his views on 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} $	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with a cadence of certain specified dates. I think that's probably all that I can say, to stay
$ \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} $	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that matter, and then he will obviously deliver his views on that. We note, as I've said now and as I said last week, that the principle that you addressed in PO6 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} $	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with a cadence of certain specified dates. I think that's probably all that I can say, to stay safely on the line of confidentiality.
$ \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} $	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that matter, and then he will obviously deliver his views on that. We note, as I've said now and as I said last week, that the principle that you addressed in PO6 of the general duty of mutual respect and comity is a principle 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with a cadence of certain specified dates. I think that's probably all that I can say, to stay safely on the line of confidentiality. THE CHAIRMAN: I certainly don't want you to stray across
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that matter, and then he will obviously deliver his views on that. We note, as I've said now and as I said last week, that the principle that you addressed in PO6 of the general duty of mutual respect and comity is a principle that you tied both to your conduct of the proceedings 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with a cadence of certain specified dates. I think that's probably all that I can say, to stay safely on the line of confidentiality. THE CHAIRMAN: I certainly don't want you to stray across that line.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that matter, and then he will obviously deliver his views on that. We note, as I've said now and as I said last week, that the principle that you addressed in PO6 of the general duty of mutual respect and comity is a principle that you tied both to your conduct of the proceedings and the Neutral Expert's conduct of the proceedings. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with a cadence of certain specified dates. I think that's probably all that I can say, to stay safely on the line of confidentiality. THE CHAIRMAN: I certainly don't want you to stray across that line. The reason I asked the question was: I am 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\\22\\23\end{array} $	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that matter, and then he will obviously deliver his views on that. We note, as I've said now and as I said last week, that the principle that you addressed in PO6 of the general duty of mutual respect and comity is a principle that you tied both to your conduct of the proceedings 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with a cadence of certain specified dates. I think that's probably all that I can say, to stay safely on the line of confidentiality. THE CHAIRMAN: I certainly don't want you to stray across that line.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 preliminary partial award. You said that it might be helpful, and that it may be relevant to the Neutral Expert proceeding. Can you be a little more specific as to why it would be helpful in that context? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I suppose that I can do from the public record of the Neutral Expert proceedings that's on the record of this case and posted on the PCA website. You will know, and as I addressed in opening, the Neutral Expert is, if I can put it this way, in the middle of a competence process. Both Pakistan and India have filed submissions on competence; that's paragraph 7 of Annexure F. He has convened again, on the public record a third meeting of the Neutral Expert on 10 and 11 September to take place in front of him, in which oral arguments are going to be made on that matter, and then he will obviously deliver his views on that. We note, as I've said now and as I said last week, that the principle that you addressed in PO6 of the general duty of mutual respect and comity is a principle that you tied both to your conduct of the proceedings and the Neutral Expert's conduct of the proceedings. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	And then we have paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F, which says "Questions" so this is the Neutral Expert's competence "Questions arising under the provisions of", inter alia, "Paragraph 11 of Annexure D". So the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with and this you can simply surmise from the fact that Pakistan has brought a competence challenge the task that the Neutral Expert will be faced with is determining what comes within the scope of paragraph 11 of Annexure D and paragraph 1(11) of Annexure F. Now, you will also have seen from the publicly available documents from the Neutral Expert proceeding, notably the supplemental rules and the work schedule which has been published, that the Neutral Expert has organised his proceedings in a particular way, with a cadence of certain specified dates. I think that's probably all that I can say, to stay safely on the line of confidentiality. THE CHAIRMAN: I certainly don't want you to stray across that line. The reason I asked the question was: I am trying to

15:28 1	Expert's work in the near term. And it seems to me that	15:31 1	He also relied on load. And as I said to you on
2	if there was in, say, the Baglihar determination or in	2	Friday and it's a point that we'll come back to again
3	the Kishenganga partial or final awards some kind of	3	and again if we need to the pondage calculation is
4	discussion of the competence of a Neutral Expert, that	4	calibrated on the hydrology of the river. You cannot
5	one might then wonder: is there res judicata or	5	have a pondage calculation under Annexure D that is
6	precedential effects that flow from that? Then I can	6	rooted in installed capacity or that is rooted in
7	begin to see the value in having a partial award from us	7	India's statement of load, because it would just make
8	on this issue of res judicata effects. But given that	8	the entire exercise unreal and unbearable.
9	my own reading of those decisions is that they generally	9	Now without for a moment saying anything about the
10	don't address the issue of competence of the Neutral	10	content of the Neutral Expert proceedings, if you had
10	Expert, it wasn't immediately apparent to me why	10	issued a preliminary partial award on the effect of
11	it would be helpful.	11	Baglihar, the effect of the Neutral Expert
12	Now, that's different from your point about	12	[Determination] on your proceedings, that would have
13	addressing perhaps a general duty of respect and comity	13	changed the nature of our case. And I think you can
14	between the Neutral Expert and the Court of Arbitration.	14	draw conclusions from that.
	So I'm parking that momentarily and just asking more		
16 17	about the other issue.	16 17	THE CHAIRMAN: So a last question on this and then we can take our break
		17	take our break.
18	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, let me perhaps sort of react to it	18	Assuming it is helpful in the context of the Neutral
19	this way; but in doing so, let me say quite clearly and	19	Expert proceedings and other matters as we move forward,
20	for the record that in the observations that I've just	20	and further taking for granted the Court will take the
21	made, this is Pakistan reacting to a question that was	21	time it needs to issue a well-reasoned award, is there
22	raised by the Court. We did not put in our final	22	a particular point in time where it would be helpful, no
23	submissions or in our oral statement a request to the	23	later than this point, to have such an award?
24	Court to make a preliminary partial award. So we were	24	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I don't think that I can say that,
25	responding there.	25	partly because we don't know how the Neutral Expert is
	Page 53		Page 55
	-		-
15:30 1	But let me address your question in the following	15:33 1	going to address competence, partly because we don't
15:30 1 2	But let me address your question in the following way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had	15:33 1 2	going to address competence, partly because we don't know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may
2	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had	2	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may
2 3	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a)	2 3	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may
2 3 4	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings	2 3 4	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the
2 3 4 5	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very	2 3 4 5	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in
2 3 4 5 6	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the	2 3 4 5 6	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written
2 3 4 5 6 7	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very	2 3 4 5 6 7	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual elements in relation to freeboard, as you heard from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right. We are conscious that, with the World Bank's pause,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual elements in relation to freeboard, as you heard from Dr Miles, where we think that he got the bottom line	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right. We are conscious that, with the World Bank's pause, Pakistan has been very, very seriously debilitated and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual elements in relation to freeboard, as you heard from Dr Miles, where we think that he got the bottom line correct, but that's only because that wasn't sort of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right. We are conscious that, with the World Bank's pause, Pakistan has been very, very seriously debilitated and damaged by the long delay, because Kishenganga is now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual elements in relation to freeboard, as you heard from Dr Miles, where we think that he got the bottom line correct, but that's only because that wasn't sort of inveigled by his methodology.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right. We are conscious that, with the World Bank's pause, Pakistan has been very, very seriously debilitated and damaged by the long delay, because Kishenganga is now set in stone. And whatever happens with regard to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual elements in relation to freeboard, as you heard from Dr Miles, where we think that he got the bottom line correct, but that's only because that wasn't sort of inveigled by his methodology. But we think he got it absolutely wrong, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right. We are conscious that, with the World Bank's pause, Pakistan has been very, very seriously debilitated and damaged by the long delay, because Kishenganga is now set in stone. And whatever happens with regard to Kishenganga, as I suggested, it's going to be a brave
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual elements in relation to freeboard, as you heard from Dr Miles, where we think that he got the bottom line correct, but that's only because that wasn't sort of inveigled by his methodology. But we think he got it absolutely wrong, and the consequence of him getting it absolutely wrong is that	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right. We are conscious that, with the World Bank's pause, Pakistan has been very, very seriously debilitated and damaged by the long delay, because Kishenganga is now set in stone. And whatever happens with regard to Kishenganga, as I suggested, it's going to be a brave Court or a brave Neutral Expert that's going to say to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual elements in relation to freeboard, as you heard from Dr Miles, where we think that he got the bottom line correct, but that's only because that wasn't sort of inveigled by his methodology. But we think he got it absolutely wrong, and the consequence of him getting it absolutely wrong is that you've got run-of-river plants that, on his approach to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right. We are conscious that, with the World Bank's pause, Pakistan has been very, very seriously debilitated and damaged by the long delay, because Kishenganga is now set in stone. And whatever happens with regard to Kishenganga, as I suggested, it's going to be a brave Court or a brave Neutral Expert that's going to say to India, "Tear down this dam". But you need to get it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual elements in relation to freeboard, as you heard from Dr Miles, where we think that he got the bottom line correct, but that's only because that wasn't sort of inveigled by his methodology. But we think he got it absolutely wrong is that you've got run-of-river plants that, on his approach to the calculation of pondage, would have more pondage than 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right. We are conscious that, with the World Bank's pause, Pakistan has been very, very seriously debilitated and damaged by the long delay, because Kishenganga is now set in stone. And whatever happens with regard to Kishenganga, as I suggested, it's going to be a brave Court or a brave Neutral Expert that's going to say to India, "Tear down this dam". But you need to get it right, and we are not going to press you beyond that.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 way. Let's assume for the moment that this Court had issued a preliminary partial award on the Article 35(a) question six months ago. The nature of our pleadings would have been very different; or, if not very different in terms of some of the substance of the interpretation of paragraph 8, will have been very different in terms of the reliance that we might have been able to place on the Kishenganga award or how we approached the Baglihar decision. We have made it absolutely plain to you we are not sort of hiding the parcel here in any shape or form that we consider that Raymond Lafitte's analysis in the Baglihar determination was fundamentally flawed, to its absolute core. There may be some residual elements in relation to freeboard, as you heard from Dr Miles, where we think that he got the bottom line correct, but that's only because that wasn't sort of inveigled by his methodology. But we think he got it absolutely wrong, and the consequence of him getting it absolutely wrong is that you've got run-of-river plants that, on his approach to the calculation of pondage, would have more pondage than storage plants. Now, that just cannot be right within 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	know how you are going to come out. I mean, you may come out in your award completely against us, which may cause us all to rethink. We don't have any sense on the public record of the timing of the subsequent phases in the Neutral Expert's work programme: they're all written into the public document as "TBD". We are resolved here, in coming to you and I said this openly on the very first day that you should take as much time as you need, because the award that you will give is an award of systemic interpretation which goes beyond Baglihar, it goes beyond Ratle. It goes to the 201 or all the other plants that may be planned for the Western Rivers in due course, so we want you to get it right. We are conscious that, with the World Bank's pause, Pakistan has been very, very seriously debilitated and damaged by the long delay, because Kishenganga is now set in stone. And whatever happens with regard to Kishenganga, as I suggested, it's going to be a brave Court or a brave Neutral Expert that's going to say to India, "Tear down this dam". But you need to get it right, and we are not going to press you beyond that.

15:34 1	that the Court would need to consider and resolve for	16:01 1	Dr Miles will appear before you tomorrow to provide
2	itself if you decided that you were going to issue	2	further responses where issues of Treaty interpretations
3	a preliminary partial award. Because, for example	3	may arise.
4	and I just take a hypothetical if you were to say,	4	We have been presented with 13 main questions
5	"We consider that we are bound by the Kishenganga Court	5	concerning pondage. Several of these have secondary
6	partial award and final award; for example, the partial	6	elements of enquiry within the overall question. My
0 7	award on drawdown flushing", does that mean that you are	0 7	response will reorganise the order of the questions
8	not going to address drawdown flushing when it comes to	8	somewhat to provide a progression of information, where
9	the issues with which you are engaged?	8 9	the response to some items may inform my subsequent
9 10	So you will have to consider whether a preliminary		
	partial award effectively, even if not in terms,	10	responses. Importantly, I'm only discussing primarily six items, which are mainly technical, and Dr Miles will
11 12	addresses aspects of the substantive matters of which	11	pick up the remainder.
12	you are seised before you actually get to them. You	12	
13	will have to consider whether anything that you say	13	For my presentation today, I am responding to your
14	would warrant a reopening of any arguments, that we can	14 15	questions based on how the criteria presented in the Treaty for the calculation of the maximum pondage would
15	make submissions on what you've said.	15	
10	So I don't, by any means, come to you and say: this	10	be interpreted by an experienced and practising
		17	hydropower engineer.
18	is absolutely straightforward, there's no controversy,		(Slide 2) So I'm going to start with question 26, which, as it says here which I can't read with my
19 20	we are asking you for it. We are saying to you that: we	19 20	-
	agree that a preliminary partial award on such issues would be helpful; this said, I note that there may be	20	glasses, so I take it that you know there are four elements to the question, four specific items, as
21 22	a fine line to be drawn, and that's a matter for you to	21	enumerated on the slide. But to understand these
22	address in your deliberations.	22	issues, I want to first illustrate the meaning of the
23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. That's very helpful, Sir Daniel,	23	terms and their use within the Treaty, and then we'll
24	and much appreciated.	24	come back to the specific responses.
25		25	come back to the specific responses.
	Page 57		Page 59
17.04		1600 1	
15:36 1	So we are indeed not only at but past the normal	16:02 1	(Slide 3) So this diagram was presented by Dr Morris
2	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is	2	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of
2 3	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient	2 3	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall
2 3 4	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue.	2 3 4	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the
2 3 4 5	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think	2 3 4 5	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between
2 3 4 5 6	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So	2 3 4 5 6	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to
2 3 4 5 6 7	time for the coffee break. I think the Court isprepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficienttime for you to regroup and be ready to continue.SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I thinkPeter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine.	2 3 4 5 6 7	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. So I see that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. So I see that, Mr Rae, you're at the podium, and you are going to speak	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. So I see that, Mr Rae, you're at the podium, and you are going to speak to us on the questions relating to pondage. So whenever	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. So I see that, Mr Rae, you're at the podium, and you are going to speak to us on the questions relating to pondage. So whenever you're ready, why don't you proceed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. So I see that, Mr Rae, you're at the podium, and you are going to speak to us on the questions relating to pondage. So whenever you're ready, why don't you proceed. Submissions on Engineering Issues Relevant to Pondage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in this case for the Neelum River, and this is illustrated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. So I see that, Mr Rae, you're at the podium, and you are going to speak to us on the questions relating to pondage. So whenever you're ready, why don't you proceed. Submissions on Engineering Issues Relevant to Pondage MR RAE: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in this case for the Neelum River, and this is illustrated by the lower horizontal line that I just added to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. So I see that, Mr Rae, you're at the podium, and you are going to speak to us on the questions relating to pondage. So whenever you're ready, why don't you proceed. Submissions on Engineering Issues Relevant to Pondage MR RAE: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. As you say, I am here before you today 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} $	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in this case for the Neelum River, and this is illustrated by the lower horizontal line that I just added to the figure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. So I see that, Mr Rae, you're at the podium, and you are going to speak to us on the questions relating to pondage. So whenever you're ready, why don't you proceed. Submissions on Engineering Issues Relevant to Pondage MR RAE: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. As you say, I am here before you today to provide a response to several of the questions 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in this case for the Neelum River, and this is illustrated by the lower horizontal line that I just added to the figure. I will try to point to some things here, but I must
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm) (A short break) (4.01 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. So I see that, Mr Rae, you're at the podium, and you are going to speak to us on the questions relating to pondage. So whenever you're ready, why don't you proceed. Submissions on Engineering Issues Relevant to Pondage MR RAE: (Slide 1) Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. As you say, I am here before you today to provide a response to several of the questions concerning maximum allowable pondage. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in this case for the Neelum River, and this is illustrated by the lower horizontal line that I just added to the figure. I will try to point to some things here, but I must apologise: there is a bit of lag in the movement but you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm)	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in this case for the Neelum River, and this is illustrated by the lower horizontal line that I just added to the figure. I will try to point to some things here, but I must apologise: there is a bit of lag in the movement but you see the cursor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm)	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in this case for the Neelum River, and this is illustrated by the lower horizontal line that I just added to the figure. I will try to point to some things here, but I must apologise: there is a bit of lag in the movement but you see the cursor. The lower horizontal line is not the absolute
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm)	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in this case for the Neelum River, and this is illustrated by the lower horizontal line that I just added to the figure. I will try to point to some things here, but I must apologise: there is a bit of lag in the movement but you see the cursor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 time for the coffee break. I think the Court is prepared to come back at 4 o'clock, if that's sufficient time for you to regroup and be ready to continue. SIR DANIEL: I think if one person can "group", then I think Peter Rae is "grouped"; he doesn't have to regroup. So 25 minutes for a coffee break would be fine. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'll see you at 4 o'clock. Thank you so much. SIR DANIEL: Thank you. (3.37 pm)	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	and Dr Miles last week to illustrate the variability of the river flow in the Himalayan region. You will recall that it shows the annual flow of the Neelum River at the site of the Neelum-Jhelum hydropower station between 2019 and 2023. However, we can also use this to illustrate the meaning of the firm and secondary power. The diagram shows the variation in the river flow rate through a period of four years. In my presentation last week, I stated that firm power and firm energy are inputs to any generation planning analysis. In essence, they determine how much of the demand forecast can be reliably provided by any given power station. In terms of a run-of-river hydropower, there is no regulation of the annual stream flow. So without regulation, the firm capabilities of power and energy are provided from the minimums of the flow record, in this case for the Neelum River, and this is illustrated by the lower horizontal line that I just added to the figure. I will try to point to some things here, but I must apologise: there is a bit of lag in the movement but you see the cursor. The lower horizontal line is not the absolute

		1	
16.04 1	The firm neuron is then determined from a flow rate that	16:07 1	So as to the first point it's the question of "the
16:04 1	The firm power is then determined from a flow rate that		So as to the first point, it's the question of "the potential relevance of Secondary Power, in particular,
2	is reliably provided all year, so something close to this minimum line across the bottom, and it's the firm	23	
3			in the context of Paragraph 8(b) of Annexure D". As I illustrated in the previous slide, this
4	power which goes into the appraisal of the project's	4	-
5	economic capacity benefit.	5	secondary power enables production of energy during
6	The installed capacity is the higher line, and	6	periods when the flow rate exceeds the flow rate used
7	excuse the lag, it's a bit difficult, but it's the upper	7	for computation of firm power. The Treaty recognises
8	red dashed line. This is the rated power of the power	8	that secondary power is available, but does not provide
9	station, the rated capacity or rated power of the power	9	any criterion for its computation. As such, India can
10	station.	10	define the installed capacity of the plant according to
11	To answer a question that Dr Blackmore put to	11	their own economic optimisation. The sum of the
12	Dr Miles, the installed capacity is determined by the	12	secondary power and the firm power is equal to the
13	economic analysis that balances the marginal costs of	13	installed capacity.
14	that capacity with the marginal benefits to optimise the	14	Paragraph 8(b) of Annexure D means that India is
15	capacity. The benefits include any higher energy	15	permitted to have secondary power, but the subsequent
16	production obtained with secondary power that's	16	design criteria in paragraph 8 do not include any
17	available this is mainly during the wet season and	17	reference to the secondary power itself. As
18	the value of that energy to the power system. The	18	an engineer, I interpret paragraph 8(b) as providing
19	capacity benefit in the economic analysis is limited to	19	comfort in the face of paragraph 8(c). Paragraph 8(c)
20	the firm power, which is the lower line at the bottom.	20	makes clear that India may only fix its maximum pondage
21	The difference between the installed capacity and	21	by reference to firm power. But paragraph 8(b) makes
22	firm power is secondary power, which is indicated by the	22	clear that even though the pondage at the plant may be
23	arrow here. It's the margin between the two. The	23	limited, there is nothing stopping India from designing
24	secondary power enables the power station to produce	24	the plant with an eye to providing secondary power.
25	secondary energy when flow is available, and the	25	(Slide 5) Moving on to 26(b), which is simply
	Dage 61		Dage 62
	Page 61		Page 63
16:05 1	secondary power also enables dispatch of more power to	16:08 1	"how it" this is referring to secondary power
16:05 1 2	secondary power also enables dispatch of more power to the system during periods when peaking is possible with	16:08 1 2	"how it" this is referring to secondary power "interacts with [the] Firm Power".
	•••		
2	the system during periods when peaking is possible with	2	"interacts with [the] Firm Power".
2 3	the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power	2 3	"interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in
2 3 4	the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves	2 3 4	"interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the
2 3 4 5	the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season.	2 3 4 5	"interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to
2 3 4 5 6	the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies	2 3 4 5 6	"interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation.
2 3 4 5 6 7	the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was	2 3 4 5 6 7	"interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season.I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here. (Slide 4) So with that background, I can provide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments, coming forward.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here. (Slide 4) So with that background, I can provide a response to a couple of the specific questions. And 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments, coming forward. (Slide 6) The third and fourth points in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here. (Slide 4) So with that background, I can provide a response to a couple of the specific questions. And looking first at question 26(a). 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments, coming forward. (Slide 6) The third and fourth points in the question are related, and they deal with the duration of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here. (Slide 4) So with that background, I can provide a response to a couple of the specific questions. And looking first at question 26(a). In my experience, it's always important to be very 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments, coming forward. (Slide 6) The third and fourth points in the question are related, and they deal with the duration of the firm and secondary power, and the timing of 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} $	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here. (Slide 4) So with that background, I can provide a response to a couple of the specific questions. And looking first at question 26(a). In my experience, it's always important to be very precise in the definition of the terms and 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} $	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments, coming forward. (Slide 6) The third and fourth points in the question are related, and they deal with the duration of the firm and secondary power, and the timing of that power within the year.
$ \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 system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here. (Slide 4) So with that background, I can provide a response to a couple of the specific questions. And looking first at question 26(a). In my experience, it's always important to be very precise in the definition of the terms and the application in the various stages of the analysis. 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} $	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments, coming forward. (Slide 6) The third and fourth points in the question are related, and they deal with the duration of the firm and secondary power, and the timing of that power within the year. (Slide 7) In order to answer this, I'm going back 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} $	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here. (Slide 4) So with that background, I can provide a response to a couple of the specific questions. And looking first at question 26(a). In my experience, it's always important to be very precise in the definition of the terms and the application in the various stages of the analysis. The technical terms that we use have very precise meanings, 	$ \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} $	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments, coming forward. (Slide 6) The third and fourth points in the question are related, and they deal with the duration of the firm and secondary power, and the timing of that power within the year. (Slide 7) In order to answer this, I'm going back to the annual hydrographs. And this is again the 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} $	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here. (Slide 4) So with that background, I can provide a response to a couple of the specific questions. And looking first at question 26(a). In my experience, it's always important to be very precise in the definition of the terms and the application in the various stages of the analysis. The technical terms that we use have very precise meanings, and it's important to be consistent in the use 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} $	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments, coming forward. (Slide 6) The third and fourth points in the question are related, and they deal with the duration of the firm and secondary power, and the timing of that power within the year. (Slide 7) In order to answer this, I'm going back to the annual hydrographs. And this is again the daily flows available at 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\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 the system during periods when peaking is possible with the available energy. Effectively, the secondary power is used for peaking at any time of the year, and serves to capture more energy in the wet season. I've dealt with many hydropower feasibility studies over the years where a key output of our analysis was the assessment of the firm capabilities of the plant within a detailed generation expansion planning context, or as stand-alone projects where the project is small relative to the power system. The information obtained from these analyses is used in the economic and financial analysis of project viability, and the terms involved are precisely what I'm demonstrating to you here. (Slide 4) So with that background, I can provide a response to a couple of the specific questions. And looking first at question 26(a). In my experience, it's always important to be very precise in the definition of the terms and the application in the various stages of the analysis. The technical terms that we use have very precise meanings, and it's important to be consistent in the use of the terminology and to understand the precision, so 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} $	 "interacts with [the] Firm Power". The installed capacity of the power station is, in broad terms, equal to the sum of the firm power and the secondary power. The two values interact according to that simple summation. Firm power is determined from the specific definition in the Treaty, given as paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D. And the secondary power is determined by India based on their analysis of the optimum installed capacity. Keep in mind that each of the three terms I'm using here is the power given in megawatts. And the terminology of the Treaty is consistent in respect of the use of power, as I will explain in a few moments, coming forward. (Slide 6) The third and fourth points in the question are related, and they deal with the duration of the firm and secondary power, and the timing of that power within the year. (Slide 7) In order to answer this, I'm going back to the annual hydrographs. And this is again the daily flows available at Neelum-Jhelum.

16:10 1	power is available throughout the year, and it is the	16:13 1	for you.
2	predominant amount available in the dry seasons.	2	DR BLACKMORE: Which you just answered. I just thought
3	Secondary power occurs any time that the flow exceeds	3	it would be clearer if, when you have partial secondary,
4	the minimum mean discharge required for calculation of	4	you've got firm power plus partial secondary; and then
5	the firm power.	5	for the second or the third box on the right, you've got
6	Note that the secondary power can be used by India	6	firm power plus all of secondary power.
0 7	during low-flow periods with the available pondage.	0 7	MR RAE: You're absolutely correct. The yellow and green,
8	This is a flexibility made available to India within the	8	you're getting firm and a portion of secondary.
8 9	terms of the Treaty. The energy available on any day	9	DR BLACKMORE: Yes.
10	may be dispatched to the power system at more than the	10	MR RAE: So, absolutely correct.
10	firm power if the operator opts to use the secondary	10	THE CHAIRMAN: It's very clever to answer the question
11	power in place of the firm power. If a run-of-river	11	before it has been asked!
12	project has no pondage, then secondary power would not	12	MR RAE: (Slide 9) So if I go forward, the firm power is
13	be available in the low-flow periods.	13	available at any time when the flow is at or below the
14	(Slide 8) Again, to give a little bit more context,	14	minimum mean discharge. And as Dr Blackmore correctly
15	I'm including this slide to give a quick illustration of	15	observes, firm power is actually available throughout
10	the frequency of occurrence of firm power and secondary	10	the year. The secondary power is a margin on top of the
18	power. This is a screen capture of a spreadsheet that	18	firm power which is available any time the flow rate is
10	gives the ten-day mean discharges for the Kiru	10	greater than the minimum mean discharge. And the
20	hydropower project, and the years are shown as you go	20	pondage enables secondary power to be used in any period
20	from left to right across the diagram and the ten-day	20	by adjusting the duration of the generation with the
22	periods are read vertically in the columns.	22	available energy.
23	And I don't expect anyone to be able to read this	23	I have illustrated this using ten-day mean flows for
23	data shown on the slide, but it has been provided by	23 24	convenience, given that you can't read the diagram.
25	Pakistan in Appendix E1 of its Memorial.	25	It's still more convenient than looking at dailies. The
		-	
	Page 65		Page 67
16:11 1	What I've done here is to set the formatting so that	16.15 1	actual conditions will be determined looking at the
16:11 1 2	What I've done here is to set the formatting so that all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean	16:15 1 2	actual conditions will be determined looking at the daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows
2	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean	2	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows
	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly	2 3	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so
2 3	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean	2 3 4	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below
2 3 4	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows	2 3 4 5	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge.
2 3 4	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean	2 3 4 5 6	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flowshave greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, soyou would see a greater frequency of the days belowminimum mean discharge.However, this is consistent with the Treaty by
2 3 4 5 6	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods	2 3 4 5 6 7	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flowshave greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, soyou would see a greater frequency of the days belowminimum mean discharge.However, this is consistent with the Treaty byrecognising that the "available only during certain
2 3 4 5 6 7	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge.However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge.However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge.However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge.However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow periods below the minimum mean discharge do occur	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and firm capacity?"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow periods below the minimum mean discharge do occur frequently in the dry season, perhaps about 10% of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and firm capacity?"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow periods below the minimum mean discharge do occur frequently in the dry season, perhaps about 10% of the time in a given year, although it varies, especially in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and firm capacity?" This refers to the terminology used in the Treaty and makes comparison to similar terminology used in some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow periods below the minimum mean discharge do occur frequently in the dry season, perhaps about 10% of the time in a given year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and firm capacity?" This refers to the terminology used in the Treaty and makes comparison to similar terminology used in some reference texts.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow periods below the minimum mean discharge do occur frequently in the dry season, perhaps about 10% of the time in a given year, although it varies, especially in a wet or dry year. Pondage, in Pakistan's interpretation of the Treaty,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and firm capacity?" This refers to the terminology used in the Treaty and makes comparison to similar terminology used in some reference texts. The use of "power" and "capacity" as terms is often
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow periods below the minimum mean discharge do occur frequently in the dry season, perhaps about 10% of the time in a given year, although it varies, especially in a wet or dry year. Pondage, in Pakistan's interpretation of the Treaty, is computed to ensure that India has access to the firm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and firm capacity?" This refers to the terminology used in the Treaty and makes comparison to similar terminology used in some reference texts. The use of "power" and "capacity" as terms is often interchangeable. Both express the ability to do work at a certain rate. I'd like to point out that the Treaty does not use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow periods below the minimum mean discharge do occur frequently in the dry season, perhaps about 10% of the time in a given year, although it varies, especially in a wet or dry year. Pondage, in Pakistan's interpretation of the Treaty, is computed to ensure that India has access to the firm power in these low-flow periods which are indicated in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and firm capacity?" This refers to the terminology used in the Treaty and makes comparison to similar terminology used in some reference texts. The use of "power" and "capacity" as terms is often interchangeable. Both express the ability to do work at a certain rate. I'd like to point out that the Treaty does not use the term "capacity" in the context of power stations.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow periods below the minimum mean discharge do occur frequently in the dry season, perhaps about 10% of the time in a given year, although it varies, especially in a wet or dry year. Pondage, in Pakistan's interpretation of the Treaty, is computed to ensure that India has access to the firm power in these low-flow periods which are indicated in pink, while firm plus secondary is available in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and firm capacity?" This refers to the terminology used in the Treaty and makes comparison to similar terminology used in some reference texts. The use of "power" and "capacity" as terms is often interchangeable. Both express the ability to do work at a certain rate. I'd like to point out that the Treaty does not use
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	all ten-day periods with flow less than the minimum mean discharge are shown in pink. I trust nobody is terribly colour-blind. If the flow is above the minimum mean discharge but less than the installed capacity, it shows in the yellow colour. Secondary power is available for some time, or at part-load, during any of the periods identified in yellow. Flows above the installed capacity are in green, at which time the full amount of secondary power is available. So secondary power is available in any of the ten-day periods that are shown in yellow or green, so it is quite a continuous part of the year. This is a very simplistic representation, but illustrates that secondary power is available frequently. The low-flow periods below the minimum mean discharge do occur frequently in the dry season, perhaps about 10% of the time in a given year, although it varies, especially in a wet or dry year. Pondage, in Pakistan's interpretation of the Treaty, is computed to ensure that India has access to the firm power in these low-flow periods which are indicated in pink, while firm plus secondary is available in the yellow and green zones.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 daily flows. And you should note that the daily flows have greater variability than the ten-day mean flows, so you would see a greater frequency of the days below minimum mean discharge. However, this is consistent with the Treaty by recognising that the "available only during certain parts of the year" description appended to secondary power is not bounded in the terms of its expected timing, but it is available for significant parts of the year, with the firm power being limited by low flows is a much shorter part of the year. (Slide 10) So this takes me to question 21. And the question is: "What is the relationship between Firm Power and firm capacity?" This refers to the terminology used in the Treaty and makes comparison to similar terminology used in some reference texts. The use of "power" and "capacity" as terms is often interchangeable. Both express the ability to do work at a certain rate. I'd like to point out that the Treaty does not use the term "capacity" in the context of power stations.

16:16	1	quantities such as storage capacity or hydraulic	16:19 1	I would have you recall here that Creager and Justin was
	2	capacity.	2	written at a time when isolated power grids were more
	3	The one reference to capacity for the power	3	common, rather than our existing integrated grid
	4	facilities is given in Appendix II to Annexure D and in	4	systems. And I discussed this in some detail in the
	5	the corresponding appendix to Annexure E, describing	5	presentation last week.
	6	data to be provided by India, which states:	6	In summary then, the two terms can be considered
	7	"Maximum aggregate capacity of power units	7	interchangeable in engineering parlance, but that does
	8	Firm Power and Secondary Power."	8	not inform the meaning of "Firm Power" within the
	9	This is one of the items to be delivered.	9	Treaty, which provides a bespoke definition of the
	10	The use of the term here denotes the sum of the firm	10	concept. This will become clearer when I move on to the
	11	power and the secondary power, which is of course the	11	next question.
	12	installed capacity, which term is itself not included in	12	Picking up another point of discussion during the
	13	the Treaty.	13	week, Creager and Justin do refer to weekly computations
	14	(Slide 11) So on review of the transcript, the	14	in some parts of their text. However, this is in line
	15	actual question arises from the use of the term "firm	15	with a description of the range of possible alternatives
	16	capacity" in the reference by Creager and Justin. And	16	from run-of-river without pondage, run-of-river with
	17	I've excerpted a piece of the relevant text here from	17	varying amounts of pondage, and ultimately hydropower
	18	page 262 of Creager and Justin.	18	projects with significant storage. The text in the
	19	Here we can see that in the first part of the text,	19	reference doesn't provide any specific requirement for
	20	the wording refers to firm capacity being the portion of	20	pondage, except in the context of what the plant can
	21	the installed capacity that can perform the same	21	contribute to the power system.
	22	function as an alternative steam plant. I described	22	(Slide 12) In respect of question 22, this is
	23	this process as part of my earlier presentation, where	23	asking:
	24	a hydropower plant is evaluated relative to	24	"Can [we] explain the basis for [the] position that
	25	an equivalent thermal power plant counterfactual or	25	[the] Firm Power is calculated by reference to the
		Page 69		Page 71
16:17	1	a thermal power plant alternative.	16:20 1	power generated instantaneously, and not power
16:17	2	The second part of the reference of interest starts	2	averaged over a period, for example one day?"
16:17	2 3	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the	2 3	averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the
16:17	2 3 4	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the	2 3 4	averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed
16:17	2 3 4 5	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed	2 3	averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage.
16:17	2 3 4 5 6	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to	2 3 4 5 6	averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because	2 3 4 5 6 7	averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system.
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule,
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance.
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power",
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power system. As such, it shows how much the power system	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be useful to note here that power would be analogous to
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power system. As such, it shows how much the power system overall changes when a power station is added. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be useful to note here that power would be analogous to a flow rate in hydrology, whereas the energy would be
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power system. As such, it shows how much the power system	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be useful to note here that power would be analogous to
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power system. As such, it shows how much the power system overall changes when a power station is added. The concept of "marginal capability" recognises whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be useful to note here that power would be analogous to a flow rate in hydrology, whereas the energy would be analogous to the flow volume. Another analogy would be
16:17	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \end{array}$	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power system. As such, it shows how much the power system overall changes when a power station is added. The concept of "marginal capability" recognises whether a plant provides more capability to the power system than the plant appears to contribute on its own, because	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be useful to note here that power would be analogous to a flow rate in hydrology, whereas the energy would be analogous to the flow volume. Another analogy would be to a car's speed versus the distance travelled in
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power system. As such, it shows how much the power system overall changes when a power station is added. The concept of "marginal capability" recognises whether a plant provides more capability to the power system	$ \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} $	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be useful to note here that power would be analogous to a flow rate in hydrology, whereas the energy would be to a car's speed versus the distance travelled in a given amount of time. Power and energy fit
16:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power system. As such, it shows how much the power system overall changes when a power station is added. The concept of "marginal capability" recognises whether a plant provides more capability to the power system than the plant appears to contribute on its own, because of the timing of generation.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be useful to note here that power would be analogous to a flow rate in hydrology, whereas the energy would be to a car's speed versus the distance travelled in a given amount of time. Power and energy fit analogously to either of those.
16:17	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power system. As such, it shows how much the power system overall changes when a power station is added. The concept of "marginal capability" recognises whether a plant provides more capability to the power system than the plant appears to contribute on its own, because of the timing of generation. The use of the load curve in this text was relevant	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be useful to note here that power would be analogous to a flow rate in hydrology, whereas the energy would be to a car's speed versus the distance travelled in a given amount of time. Power and energy fit analogously to either of those.
16:17	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \end{array}$	The second part of the reference of interest starts at the paragraph here (indicating). It refers to the capacity being related to the minimum stream flow at the time of the peak load, the pondage, the installed capacity, the load curve and the interrelationship to other plants. The reference to pondage is here because the firm capacity is determined from the flow rate available and the volume of pondage for scheduling the capacity through a day. The relationship to other plants in this context is to determine the total power system capability as each plant is added. And keep in mind, as I referred to my previous presentation, the firm capacity at any time is the marginal capability of the power system when the specified power station is added to the overall power system. As such, it shows how much the power system overall changes when a power station is added. The concept of "marginal capability" recognises whether a plant provides more capability to the power system than the plant appears to contribute on its own, because of the timing of generation. The use of the load curve in this text was relevant to ensure that the load was available to absorb all	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 averaged over a period, for example one day?" And question 22 requires clarification of the terminology used in the Treaty and how it is expressed in engineering usage. Power in general is the rate of transferring energy and is measured in watts. A watt is the International System of Units unit for power; International System of Units being the modern version of the metric system. And 1 watt is equal to 1 joule per second. The joule, correspondingly, is the unit for energy, which is equal to the work done by a unit force acting through a unit distance. When Dr Miles referred to "instantaneous power", he was making the point that power is a rate, not an absolute amount or volume, like energy. It can be useful to note here that power would be analogous to a flow rate in hydrology, whereas the energy would be to a car's speed versus the distance travelled in a given amount of time. Power and energy fit analogously to either of those. When I recall the discussion from the transcript of the specific exchange, the confusion appears to arise in

16:22 1	taken as energy, so deals with the aggregate amount over	16:25 1	"firm capacity". If I understood you correctly, you
10.22 1	a period of time, rather than the rate.	10.25 1	said that "firm power" and "firm capacity" are terms
3	(Slide 13) So this comes to the next issue. And	3	that can be used interchangeably. Does that also then
4	reference to the Treaty provides some clarity in this	4	relate to the redefinition of "Firm Power" in the
5	matter. Annexure D, paragraph 2(i) gives us the	5	Treaty? Under that specific Treaty definition of "Firm
6	definition of "Firm Power". And I'll go through this	6	Power", should that then also keep does that also
7	from the perspective of a hydropower engineer. If	7	mean that "firm capacity" is therefore also redefined?
8	further legal interpretation is required, it may be	8	MR RAE: Well, I did mention that "firm capacity" is not
8 9	taken up by Dr Miles tomorrow.	9	given in the Treaty.
10	But if we look at the definition, it firstly tells	10	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No. But given that you said that
10	us that we are computing the hydroelectric power. So	10	"firm power" and "firm capacity" are two terms that are
11	the definition simply says:	11	used interchangeably, which here you mean that they're
12	"Firm Power' means the hydro-electric power"	12	essentially synonyms. Then with "Firm Power" in the
13	And continues. The next thing it tells us, it gives	13	Treaty is
14	us a flow rate to use in the computation, which is the	14	MR RAE: Not quite. What I'm saying is they're often used
15	minimum mean discharge.	15	interchangeably. And different texts will give them
10	Once we have determined that it is hydroelectric	10	different definitions, but they're then consistent
17	power, the form of the equation that I show here	17	within their own use.
18	applies. The equation has several terms, and this was	18	What I'm saying here is that we have a specific
20	presented to you earlier by Dr Miles. But the other	20	bespoke definition which is applicable to the Treaty,
20 21	terms are: the mass density of water and gravitational	20 21	and we must be careful to deal with that definition
21 22	acceleration. These are natural parameters, not	21 22	precisely, both in terms of what it includes and how
22	variable by either party. Efficiency of the generating	22	it is calculated. And then its purpose within the
23	units, where the turbines, generators, transformers,	23	Treaty is what we're interested in following up. I'm
25	et cetera, are specific to the hydropower business, and	25	very reluctant to start bringing in extraneous terms
	Page 73		Page 75
16:23 1	they would be known by having defined the power as	16:26 1	that are not given in the Treaty.
16:23 1 2	they would be known by having defined the power as hydroelectric power.	16:26 1 2	that are not given in the Treaty. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.
	they would be known by having defined the power as hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the		that are not given in the Treaty. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem
2	hydroelectric power.	2	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.
2 3	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the	2 3	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem
2 3 4	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating	2 3 4	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong
2 3 4 5	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to	2 3 4 5	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow
2 3 4 5 6	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of	2 3 4 5 6	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant
2 3 4 5 6 7	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for	2 3 4 5 6 7	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the slide, which I don't think is necessary to go through.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific procedure for calculation of the minimum mean discharge,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the slide, which I don't think is necessary to go through. But a watt is a kilogram metre squared per second	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific procedure for calculation of the minimum mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the slide, which I don't think is necessary to go through. But a watt is a kilogram metre squared per second cubed, in the International System of Units. And this,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific procedure for calculation of the minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge equals X amount in cubic metres per second.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the slide, which I don't think is necessary to go through. But a watt is a kilogram metre squared per second cubed, in the International System of Units. And this, when you go through the equation, is what you end up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific procedure for calculation of the minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge, pROFESSOR BUYTAERT: So in this case, could it then 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} $	 hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the slide, which I don't think is necessary to go through. But a watt is a kilogram metre squared per second cubed, in the International System of Units. And this, when you go through the equation, is what you end up with. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, a question here from 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} $	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific procedure for calculation of the minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge equals X amount in cubic metres per second. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: So in this case, could it then have been reformulated as "the hydroelectric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge through the plant or through the turbines", rather than just
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the slide, which I don't think is necessary to go through. But a watt is a kilogram metre squared per second cubed, in the International System of Units. And this, when you go through the equation, is what you end up with. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, a question here from	$ \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 BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific procedure for calculation of the minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge, corresponding to the minimum mean discharge through the plant in cubic metres per second. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: So in this case, could it then have been reformulated as "the hydroelectric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge through the plant or through the turbines", rather than just mentioning "at the site of [the] plant"? I can imagine
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the slide, which I don't think is necessary to go through. But a watt is a kilogram metre squared per second cubed, in the International System of Units. And this, when you go through the equation, is what you end up with. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, a question here from 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} $	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific procedure for calculation of the minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge equals X amount in cubic metres per second. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: So in this case, could it then have been reformulated as "the hydroelectric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge through the plant or through the turbines", rather than just mentioning "at the site of [the] plant"? I can imagine India, for instance, arguing that that simply means the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the slide, which I don't think is necessary to go through. But a watt is a kilogram metre squared per second cubed, in the International System of Units. And this, when you go through the equation, is what you end up with. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, a question here from Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Mr Rae, actually, two questions, if 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific procedure for calculation of the minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge, corresponding to the minimum mean discharge through the plant in cubic metres per second. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: So in this case, could it then have been reformulated as "the hydroelectric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge through the plant or through the turbines", rather than just mentioning "at the site of [the] plant"? I can imagine
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 hydroelectric power. The only other piece of information not in the formula is the generating head. Well, the generating head is known in the definition by relating the power to being at the site of the plant. The topography of a particular site will determine the head available for any arrangement proposed. So once we've set those items, looking at the definition, there is no further information to be had. So we are left with the result that is computed with the definitions equal to a watt; that is, the power times density times gravity times head times efficiency. You combine those terms together and you get the dimensions of a watt, which is what I show on the other side of the slide, which I don't think is necessary to go through. But a watt is a kilogram metre squared per second cubed, in the International System of Units. And this, when you go through the equation, is what you end up with. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Rae, a question here from Professor Buytaert. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Mr Rae, actually, two questions, if you don't mind. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. Then now on this slide (13), one assumption you seem to make and please do correct me if that's wrong is that obviously the power equation relates to the flow through the turbines, so therefore through the plant itself, while the definition in the Treaty mentions that it's the minimum mean discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant. So does that mean that you treat this discharge at the site of the plant as being equal to the discharge through the plant? MR RAE: Correct, in the sense that it's referring specifically to minimum mean discharge. And keep in mind that the definition then continues, in the part which I haven't excerpted here, to give the specific procedure for calculation of the minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge, which arrives at a single value of: minimum mean discharge equals X amount in cubic metres per second. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: So in this case, could it then have been reformulated as "the hydroelectric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge through the plant or through the turbines", rather than just mentioning "at the site of [the] plant"? I can imagine India, for instance, arguing that that simply means the

16.00	1		16.20 1	and a star we have the star of the star of the star of the star
16:28		the discharge through the turbines of the plant, which	16:30 1	saying that we're dealing with power in watts, or
	2	of course is what feeds into the hydropower equation.	2	megawatts. And the Treaty has expressed that as
	3	MR RAE: No, the definition here is quite clear. It's: firm	3	a specific item, and that tells us how we're to deal
	4	power is at the minimum mean discharge. And of course,	4	with or how we can deal with that amount later.
	5	for calculating power through a turbine, so that means	5	If the Treaty had wanted to deal with flow volume,
	6	the minimum mean discharge is passing through the	6	it would have been precise and would have said "flow
	7	turbine.	7	volume". But the Treaty hasn't said that. It said
	8	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.	8	"power", which is a rate of energy production.
	9	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear.	9	So when we come and we will come to the
	10	MR MINEAR: Just for clarity, could you repeat the	10	calculation of pondage coming up here, and we can
	11	significance of the phrase "at the site of a plant" in	11	demonstrate or discuss a little bit more around that
	12	this definition?	12	aspect as we go forward.
	13	MR RAE: Yes. For me, for my interpretation of this, "at	13	THE CHAIRMAN: But I won't pursue this too much further,
	14	the site of [the] plant" gives us a physical location	14	although Mr Minear may want to am I correct that
	15	for the plant, from which we have the topography	15	it doesn't matter what the fluid mass density is for
	16	available, if they planned to put a dam or a power	16	purpose of calculating pondage, it doesn't matter what
	17	station located some distance away. That physical	17	the acceleration of gravity is, or efficiencies are, at
	18	information will give you the head from upstream to	18	this particular site: none of that makes any difference
	19	downstream, as you determine or lay out within that	19	when it comes to calculating pondage?
	20	site.	20	MR RAE: Effectively, no, it doesn't. And all of the
	21	MR MINEAR: Thank you.	21	calculations that have been done, whether by Pakistan or
	22	THE CHAIRMAN: So Mr Rae, if I can just follow up on these	22	by India, come to the same realisation. So this is not
	23	questions a little bit.	23	a unique observation. I believe our Memorial even says
	24	Your presentation is on "Engineering issues relevant	24	as much.
	25	to pondage". Do I understand correctly that in	25	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear.
		Page 77		Page 79
				-
L				
16.00	1		16.22 1	MD MINITAD, Assis I' a start a start of the
16:29		Pakistan's approach to calculating pondage, the	16:32 1	MR MINEAR: Again, I just want to return to the Chair's
16:29	2	equations you have up on the screen right now are	2	question here. I think it might relate to some things
16:29	2 3	equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant?	2 3	question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2.
16:29	2 3 4	equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"?	2 3 4	question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is
16:29	2 3 4 5	equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my	2 3 4 5	question here. I think it might relate to some thingsthat were said in Appendix E2.But fundamentally, the critical variable here is[minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that
16:29	2 3 4 5 6	equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching	2 3 4 5 6	question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2.But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right?
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7	equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the	2 3 4 5 6 7	question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2.But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right?MR RAE: Yes.
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage.
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct?
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct.
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just my understanding, but I'm happy 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as a rate; it is not energy as a quantity of production.
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just my understanding, but I'm happy to be corrected: it's not a question of cancelling out, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as a rate; it is not energy as a quantity of production. Because when we look at the definition, I've given you
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just my understanding, but I'm happy to be corrected: it's not a question of cancelling out, it's a question of being irrelevant. You could for any 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as a rate; it is not energy as a quantity of production. Because when we look at the definition, I've given you the various terms that are coming from the words in
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just my understanding, but I'm happy to be corrected: it's not a question of cancelling out, it's a question of being irrelevant. You could for any given hydroelectric plant, under Pakistan's approach, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as a rate; it is not energy as a quantity of production. Because when we look at the definition, I've given you the various terms that are coming from the words in a precise way, but there is no reference to any time
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just my understanding, but I'm happy to be corrected: it's not a question of cancelling out, it's a question of being irrelevant. You could for any given hydroelectric plant, under Pakistan's approach, take the MMD and multiply it basically by six hours of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as a rate; it is not energy as a quantity of production. Because when we look at the definition, I've given you the various terms that are coming from the words in a precise way, but there is no reference to any time anywhere in this definition.
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just my understanding, but I'm happy to be corrected: it's not a question of cancelling out, it's a question of being irrelevant. You could for any given hydroelectric plant, under Pakistan's approach, take the MMD and multiply it basically by six hours of flow to equal pondage, without needing to go to any of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as a rate; it is not energy as a quantity of production. Because when we look at the definition, I've given you the various terms that are coming from the words in a precise way, but there is no reference to any time anywhere in this definition.
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just my understanding, but I'm happy to be corrected: it's not a question of cancelling out, it's a question of being irrelevant. You could for any given hydroelectric plant, under Pakistan's approach, take the MMD and multiply it basically by six hours of flow to equal pondage, without needing to go to any of these variables that you have up on the screen. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as a rate; it is not energy as a quantity of production. Because when we look at the definition, I've given you the various terms that are coming from the words in a precise way, but there is no reference to any time anywhere in this definition. So we're able to deal with firm power knowing that it's a rate, and then we take that forward to deal with
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just my understanding, but I'm happy to be corrected: it's not a question of cancelling out, it's a question of being irrelevant. You could for any given hydroelectric plant, under Pakistan's approach, take the MMD and multiply it basically by six hours of flow to equal pondage, without needing to go to any of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as a rate; it is not energy as a quantity of production. Because when we look at the definition, I've given you the various terms that are coming from the words in a precise way, but there is no reference to any time anywhere in this definition.
16:29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 equations you have up on the screen right now are irrelevant? MR RAE: You said "irrelevant"? THE CHAIRMAN: I said "irrelevant" because in my understanding of the way that Pakistan is approaching the calculation of pondage, it's purely driven by the MMD, with some calculations, but it has nothing to do with the fluid mass density, the acceleration of gravity, et cetera. MR RAE: We have to look at what the Treaty says, and the Treaty puts it in the context of firm power. So we go through the calculations carrying firm power through. And if at some point the various terms cancel out of the calculation I think is what you're referring to: and yes, they do, for the most part, cancel out of the equation in the end. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just my understanding, but I'm happy to be corrected: it's not a question of cancelling out, it's a question of being irrelevant. You could for any given hydroelectric plant, under Pakistan's approach, take the MMD and multiply it basically by six hours of flow to equal pondage, without needing to go to any of these variables that you have up on the screen. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 question here. I think it might relate to some things that were said in Appendix E2. But fundamentally, the critical variable here is [minimum] mean discharge, to determine pondage; is that right? MR RAE: Yes. MR MINEAR: And the other factors are not variable by and large, they're going to be fixed and it's only the [minimum] mean discharge which is going to lead to a variation in the calculation of maximum pondage. Is that correct? MR RAE: That is correct. Now, the reason to present this is to illustrate to you and there's a logic to my thought here. We're illustrating to you firm power, how it is defined in the Treaty and calculated. And it is clearly power as a rate; it is not energy as a quantity of production. Because when we look at the definition, I've given you the various terms that are coming from the words in a precise way, but there is no reference to any time anywhere in this definition. So we're able to deal with firm power knowing that it's a rate, and then we take that forward to deal with

16.22	1	we're alle te convert anogely to the anarchista terms	16.26 1	DDOEESSOD DUWTAEDT. Dut in some scientific literature
16:33	1	we're able to convert precisely to the appropriate terms for calculating the pondage. And I'll just come to how	16:36 1 2	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But in some scientific literature, firm power is sometimes referred to as the average power
	2 3	that works when we go through the definition of pondage.	2	over a critical period: for example, a day. Would that
	4	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.	4	be a definition that is incompatible with this phrasing?
	4 5	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Mr Rae, following up on that.	4	MR RAE: It would, because there's a precise definition
	6	You say that there is no explicit time period that	6	given here. And the precision of the Treaty requires
	7	is considered, but obviously the minimum mean discharge	7	that we follow the precise definition here, and
	8	is expressed as a daily value; well, daily and later	8	we shouldn't be bringing in extraneous information that
	9	ten days. Therefore, might it make sense to consider	8	has the end result of weakening the precision of the
	10	the power production at that same timeframe and, for	10	document that we're faced with.
	10	example, consider the average power that has been	10	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.
	11	produced over a day, not taking into account intra-day	11	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Rae. Please proceed.
	12	variations as they are being levelled out by pondage?	12	MR RAE: So the conclusion with respect to question 22
	13	MR RAE: Yes, keep in mind that minimum mean discharge,	13	I hope I'm at this point is that Pakistan's position
	15	following the calculation given in the remainder of	14	for the computation of firm power is expressed by the
	16	2(i), results in a value in cubic metres per second.	16	definition on the screen here from Annexure D,
	17	Again, it's giving a discharge rate; it's not giving	10	paragraph 2(i). And again, "power" is a precise term in
	18	a discharge volume. And Dr Miles did go through	18	the hydropower engineering industry and must be used
	19	an analysis of different time periods in the Treaty and	10	precisely as it is defined in the Treaty.
	20	how they apply to the calculation of pondage, and	20	(Slide 14) So that brings us to question 23,
	20	I would refer back to those discussions.	20	which is:
	22	But we do in the end, as you point out, come back to	22	"How should the term 'Firm Power' be interpreted in
	23	a 24-hour period as being most appropriate for the	23	the light of the ordinary meaning of the term? [And]
	24	consideration of the pondage. But that only informs how	23	Why was this term chosen given that it could have
	25	we do the computation, by taking a rate times a time to	25	been called something else if it didn't already have
	20		20	
		Page 81		Page 83
16.35	1	give us a volume, and then we allocate its use at the	16.38 1	a general meaning?"
16:35		give us a volume; and then we allocate its use at the firm power or as you point out, at the rate of the	16:38 1 2	a general meaning?" Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm
16:35	2	firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the	2	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm
16:35		firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge.	2 3	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special
16:35	2 3 4	firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question,	2 3 4	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in
16:35	2 3 4 5	firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge.PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in	2 3 4 5	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice.
16:35	2 3 4	firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative	2 3 4 5 6	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power
16:35	2 3 4 5 6 7	firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is	2 3 4 5 6 7	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be
16:35	2 3 4 5 6	firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this
16:35	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in
16:35	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Would you be able to elaborate as to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge. So in usual hydroengineering parlance, the "firm
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Would you be able to elaborate as to why not? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge. So in usual hydroengineering parlance, the "firm power" is different from the "firm energy", although
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Would you be able to elaborate as to why not? MR RAE: Well, again, it comes down to that we're dealing 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge. So in usual hydroengineering parlance, the "firm power" is different from the "firm energy", although both are computed from an analysis of the hydrological
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Would you be able to elaborate as to why not? MR RAE: Well, again, it comes down to that we're dealing with power as a rate. And if we want to deal with 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge. So in usual hydroengineering parlance, the "firm power" is different from the "firm energy", although both are computed from an analysis of the hydrological
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Would you be able to elaborate as to why not? MR RAE: Well, again, it comes down to that we're dealing with power as a rate. And if we want to deal with a certain amount of energy, we have to add a 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} $	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge. So in usual hydroengineering parlance, the "firm power" is different from the "firm energy", although both are computed from an analysis of the hydrological record.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Would you be able to elaborate as to why not? MR RAE: Well, again, it comes down to that we're dealing with power as a rate. And if we want to deal with a certain amount of energy, we have to add a time parameter, which means how many hours or days or weeks 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge. So in usual hydroengineering parlance, the "firm power" is different from the "firm energy", although both are computed from an analysis of the hydrological record. The Treaty provides a special meaning for the computation of "Firm Power", which is what I've
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Would you be able to elaborate as to why not? MR RAE: Well, again, it comes down to that we're dealing with power as a rate. And if we want to deal with a certain amount of energy, we have to add a time parameter, which means how many hours or days or weeks you have of generation time, to give the total energy in 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge. So in usual hydroengineering parlance, the "firm power" is different from the "firm energy", although both are computed from an analysis of the hydrological record. The Treaty provides a special meaning for the computation of "Firm Power", which is what I've illustrated just previously, and this special meaning
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Would you be able to elaborate as to why not? MR RAE: Well, again, it comes down to that we're dealing with power as a rate. And if we want to deal with a certain amount of energy, we have to add a time parameter, which means how many hours or days or weeks you have of generation time, to give the total energy in that period. It's the rate times the time that gives 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge. So in usual hydroengineering parlance, the "firm power" is different from the "firm energy", although both are computed from an analysis of the hydrological record. The Treaty provides a special meaning for the computation of "Firm Power", which is what I've illustrated just previously, and this special meaning establishes its method of computation. So confusion may
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 firm power, or, as you point out, at the rate of the minimum mean discharge. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. As a follow-up question, again just making sure we come to grips with this, in your interpretation, would a potential alternative definition have been that, for example, firm power is capped at the power produced by the minimum mean discharge? That seems to me an interpretation of the calculation that is presented in the Memorial. MR RAE: Yes, but when I'm reading this as an engineer, I don't see those words here. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: No, I'm just wondering whether that has the equivalent meaning. MR RAE: Yes, I don't think it's equivalent. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Would you be able to elaborate as to why not? MR RAE: Well, again, it comes down to that we're dealing with power as a rate. And if we want to deal with a certain amount of energy, we have to add a time parameter, which means how many hours or days or weeks you have of generation time, to give the total energy in that period. It's the rate times the time that gives you the quantity: the same as the speed of your car 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Question 23 comes back to the purpose of "Firm Power" in the Treaty and whether the use of a special definition conflicts with this general meaning in hydropower engineering practice. In my previous presentation, I stated that in power planning we use "firm power" as the power that can be assured to be available for the power station. And this is its ordinary meaning in hydropower, and especially in power planning. And it was illustrated in the figure shown earlier today. (Slide 15) And that's again what we see here: it's merely an amount of power that can be derived from a relatively low value of the flow rate, although it's not the lowest value of the flow rate by any means. In this case, it's the minimum mean discharge. So in usual hydroengineering parlance, the "firm power" is different from the "firm energy", although both are computed from an analysis of the hydrological record. The Treaty provides a special meaning for the computation of "Firm Power", which is what I've illustrated just previously, and this special meaning establishes its method of computation. So confusion may

1	"firm power for a fixed period", which converts the	16:42 1	(Slide 18) The Court has requested an analysis of
2	power to an amount of energy. And this approach was and	2	pondage assuming a seven-day cycle. And again,
3	is taken by India in their computation of pondage, as	3	a response here requires some explanation of the
4	Dr Miles demonstrated.	4	assumptions that are required to develop various
5	However, as an experienced engineer reading the	5	alternatives for the computation of pondage. Any
6	Treaty, what is clearly given here is firm power as an amount in megawatts, which is the rate computed	6	seven-day alternative we have considered includes
7		7	foundational assumptions that would be at odds with the
8	according to the definition specifically given in P_{i}	8	terms of the Treaty as interpreted by an experienced
9	paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D.	9	engineer.
10	So I don't believe that the "Firm Power" is in	10	That said, I will attempt to summarise some of the
11	conflict with this normal meaning, but the means for its	11	various approaches that we have considered during
12	calculation is short-circuited from the norm by pegging	12	preparation of Pakistan's Memorial. And in this process
13	it to the minimum mean discharge. And no extraneous	13	we looked at various positions taken previously, as well
14	information is required to interpret "Firm Power" from	14	as the conclusions of the Neutral Expert in the Baglihar
15	the Treaty.	15	case. We then made an objective review of the Treaty,
16	(Slide 16) If I can move on to question 27. This	16	essentially starting with a blank sheet to see what
17	requests information on the prevalence of low flows over	17	options might be considered.
18	a period of 25 years at the Kiru and Neelum-Jhelum	18	(Slide 19) To start this, I'd like to recap the
19	sites.	19	approach presented by Pakistan in the Memorial. The
20	Firstly though, I think it's important to clarify	20	basic foundational premise of the approach is: that firm
21	the question, or how I interpret the question.	21	power is assured for any flow condition, or any daily
22	Pakistan's calculation of pondage is designed to	22	flow condition; the flow rate and the volume available
23	achieve the firm power under all operating conditions.	23	on any day is an outcome of the natural hydrology of the
24	If the flow rate is above the minimum mean discharge,	24	site; this volume determines the energy available on any
25	then firm power is available by default. If the flow	25	day.
	Page 85		Page 87
	1 450 00		1 450 07
16:40 1	rate is at any level below the minimum mean discharge,	16:43 1	Knowing that the firm power is the power produced by
16:40 1 2	rate is at any level below the minimum mean discharge, then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient	16:43 1 2	Knowing that the firm power is the power produced by a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can
2	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient	2	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can
2 3	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of	2 3	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day
2 3 4	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow	2 3 4	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum
2 3 4 5	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river.	2 3 4 5	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the
2 3 4 5 6	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The	2 3 4 5 6	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is
2 3 4 5 6 7	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the	2 3 4 5 6 7	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of pondage that we define in the analysis. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this foundational premise that the firm power would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of pondage that we define in the analysis. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this foundational premise that the firm power would be available, but this was interpreted as continuously
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of pondage that we define in the analysis. The use of the pondage is not limited to a threshold of, say, 50% of the minimum mean discharge, as suggested 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this foundational premise that the firm power would be available, but this was interpreted as continuously during a week, with the pondage required to account for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of pondage that we define in the analysis. The use of the pondage is not limited to a threshold of, say, 50% of the minimum mean discharge, as suggested in the equation. This is only an outcome of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this foundational premise that the firm power would be available, but this was interpreted as continuously during a week, with the pondage required to account for variations in natural inflow during the week.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of pondage that we define in the analysis. The use of the pondage is not limited to a threshold of, say, 50% of the minimum mean discharge, as suggested in the equation. This is only an outcome of the analysis and does not place any restrictions on the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this foundational premise that the firm power would be available, but this was interpreted as continuously during a week, with the pondage required to account for variations in natural inflow during the week. We had dropped this approach because the result is
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of pondage that we define in the analysis. The use of the pondage is not limited to a threshold of, say, 50% of the minimum mean discharge, as suggested in the equation. This is only an outcome of the analysis and does not place any restrictions on the ability to produce firm power during these periods.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this foundational premise that the firm power would be available, but this was interpreted as continuously during a week, with the pondage required to account for variations in natural inflow during the week. We had dropped this approach because the result is very sensitive to any errors in the hydrological data,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of pondage that we define in the analysis. The use of the pondage is not limited to a threshold of, say, 50% of the minimum mean discharge, as suggested in the equation. This is only an outcome of the analysis and does not place any restrictions on the ability to produce firm power during these periods. I didn't have the data available for Neelum-Jhelum	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this foundational premise that the firm power would be available, but this was interpreted as continuously during a week, with the pondage required to account for variations in natural inflow during the week. We had dropped this approach because the result is very sensitive to any errors in the hydrological data, such as abnormally high or low daily values. It also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of pondage that we define in the analysis. The use of the pondage is not limited to a threshold of, say, 50% of the minimum mean discharge, as suggested in the equation. This is only an outcome of the analysis and does not place any restrictions on the ability to produce firm power during these periods. I didn't have the data available for Neelum-Jhelum immediately, but the relationship would be similar 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 flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this foundational premise that the firm power would be available, but this was interpreted as continuously during a week, with the pondage required to account for variations in natural inflow during the week. We had dropped this approach because the result is very sensitive to any errors in the hydrological data, such as abnormally high or low daily values. It also produced a range of potential values, and required
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	then the firm power is provided by allowing sufficient pondage for the plant to operate, with the number of generating hours determined depending on the actual flow rate of the river. The methodology does not preselect a flow rate. The flow equivalent of the pondage is an outcome of the analysis. And I'll go through the analysis again in just a moment. (Slide 17) But first, the slide here shows the daily flow duration curve for the Kiru site, and from this we can observe that the flow rate is less than the minimum mean discharge on about 13% of the days. And on these days, the firm power is available, regardless of the flow rate in the river, by using the amount of pondage that we define in the analysis. The use of the pondage is not limited to a threshold of, say, 50% of the minimum mean discharge, as suggested in the equation. This is only an outcome of the analysis and does not place any restrictions on the ability to produce firm power during these periods. I didn't have the data available for Neelum-Jhelum immediately, but the relationship would be similar to what we see here: that the firm power will be active in	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	a flow rate equal to the minimum mean discharge, we can determine the number of hours of generation on each day by dividing the available flow volume by the minimum mean discharge flow rate, which is precisely the observation that the Chairman has made. The pondage is then calculated once a daily dispatch schedule is created with the daily generating hours. I'd like to point out here that the Treaty does not make any provision for the use of installed capacity or secondary power in the calculation of pondage. The pondage only refers to the calculation of firm power in paragraph 8(c) of Annexure D. In the approach presented by Pakistan in the Baglihar dispute, the analysis was also based on this foundational premise that the firm power would be available, but this was interpreted as continuously during a week, with the pondage required to account for variations in natural inflow during the week. We had dropped this approach because the result is very sensitive to any errors in the hydrological data, such as abnormally high or low daily values. It also produced a range of potential values, and required an assumption that the firm power would be continuously

16:45	1 language of the Treaty. And Dr Miles can speak to that	16:48 1 extended to a seven-day period. And my response is that
	2 comment later on.	2 it does not have a direct extension to a seven day
	3 That said, let's look at how the calculation is	3 equivalent. The methodology provides firm power on each
	4 performed as presented in Pakistan's Memorial.	4 day as its foundational premise, and in our view, the
	5 (Slide 20) So the details of the calculation are	5 current methodology works both daily and weekly basis
	6 included in Appendix E of the Memorial, where we give	6 already. India is provided with firm power every day,
	7 various analytical methods for computation. The	7 and the energy available is a function of the hydrology
	8 principle is simply that the firm power is available for	8 of the river at the site, which determines the duration
	9 dispatch on any day, regardless of the flow available in	9 of the firm power within each day.
1	10 the river. Note here that the energy available for	10 Once the firm power has been provided each day for
1	generation during the day is a function of the total	seven days, we have met the weekly requirement that firm
1	volume within that day. What the pondage is doing is	12 power is available for the week.
	changing the natural flow rate of the river so that the	13 THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr Rae. Mr Minear has a question.
	outflow rate is sufficient to provide the firm power,	14 MR MINEAR: Perhaps you should finish your thought and then
	15 which is also a rate.	15 I'll ask my question.
1	16 This is illustrated by the simple graphic shown on	16 MR RAE: Okay. I'll be brief.
	the slide here, where we have a fixed flow rate	17 So I was just going to say here that in response to
	available, which is the red line across the middle. The	18 20(a), we're saying that there is no direct extension of
1	total volume of water obtained from this flow rate over	19 the methodology to seven days. And then I'm going to go
	20 24 hours can then be redistributed so that it is	20 into some seven-day cycles in the following comments.
	released at the minimum mean discharge rate, which	21 So perhaps your question this is good timing.
	22 produces the firm power.	22 MR MINEAR: I think my question is best after you've offered
	I could also have presented this figure directly in	23 your explanation. You might answer my question in the
2	energy and shown the accumulation of energy and the use	
2	of power. And I can equate one or the other, depending	25 you've finished your presentation on this topic, since
	Page 89	Page 91
	C	
16:46	1 on how the analysis is done.	16:49 1 you might answer my question in what you're about
	 on how the analysis is done. But for any flow rate, the calculation requires 	2 to say.
	But for any flow rate, the calculation requiresthree steps.	 to say. MR RAE: Okay.
	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from 	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does
	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. 	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow
	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is 	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred
	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate 	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty.
	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the 	 2 to say. 3 MR RAE: Okay. 4 So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does 5 assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow 6 volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred 7 or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. 8 (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create
	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver 	 2 to say. 3 MR RAE: Okay. 4 So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does 5 assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow 6 volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred 7 or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. 8 (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create 9 various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires
1	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver firm power for the available flow rate. The daily 	 2 to say. 3 MR RAE: Okay. 4 So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does 5 assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow 6 volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred 7 or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. 8 (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create 9 various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires 10 making some assumptions. In the course of the
1	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver firm power for the available flow rate. The daily generating time gives a dispatch schedule. 	 2 to say. 3 MR RAE: Okay. 4 So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does 5 assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow 6 volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred 7 or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. 8 (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create 9 various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires 10 making some assumptions. In the course of the 11 preparation of the Memorial, we developed several
11111	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver firm power for the available flow rate. The daily generating time gives a dispatch schedule. We can then compute the pondage from the inflow 	 2 to say. 3 MR RAE: Okay. 4 So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does 5 assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow 6 volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred 7 or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. 8 (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create 9 various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires 10 making some assumptions. In the course of the 11 preparation of the Memorial, we developed several 12 alternative approaches, but each of these were
1 1 1 1	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver firm power for the available flow rate. The daily generating time gives a dispatch schedule. We can then compute the pondage from the inflow volume that can accumulate during the hours when the 	 2 to say. 3 MR RAE: Okay. 4 So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does 5 assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow 6 volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred 7 or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. 8 (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create 9 various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires 10 making some assumptions. In the course of the 11 preparation of the Memorial, we developed several 12 alternative approaches, but each of these were 13 ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of
1 1 1 1 1	But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver firm power for the available flow rate. The daily generating time gives a dispatch schedule. We can then compute the pondage from the inflow volume that can accumulate during the hours when the plant is not operating.	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires making some assumptions. In the course of the preparation of the Memorial, we developed several alternative approaches, but each of these were ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for
1 1 1 1 1 1	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver firm power for the available flow rate. The daily generating time gives a dispatch schedule. We can then compute the pondage from the inflow volume that can accumulate during the hours when the plant is not operating. The plant will store water for part of the day and 	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires making some assumptions. In the course of the preparation of the Memorial, we developed several alternative approaches, but each of these were ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for application.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 But for any flow rate, the calculation requires three steps. Firstly, we calculate the firm power from paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago. Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver firm power for the available flow rate. The daily generating time gives a dispatch schedule. We can then compute the pondage from the inflow volume that can accumulate during the hours when the plant is not operating. The plant will store water for part of the day and release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the 	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires making some assumptions. In the course of the preparation of the Memorial, we developed several alternative approaches, but each of these were ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for application. Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2But for any flow rate, the calculation requires3three steps.4Firstly, we calculate the firm power from5paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago.6Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is7equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate8divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the9number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver10firm power for the available flow rate. The daily11generating time gives a dispatch schedule.12We can then compute the pondage from the inflow13volume that can accumulate during the hours when the14plant is not operating.15The plant will store water for part of the day and16release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the17day.	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires making some assumptions. In the course of the preparation of the Memorial, we developed several alternative approaches, but each of these were ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for application. Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details of the daily flow record, and in fact, the results are
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2But for any flow rate, the calculation requires3three steps.4Firstly, we calculate the firm power from5paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago.6Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is7equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate8divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the9number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver10firm power for the available flow rate. The daily11generating time gives a dispatch schedule.12We can then compute the pondage from the inflow13volume that can accumulate during the hours when the14plant is not operating.15The plant will store water for part of the day and16release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the17day.18The rest of the calculations in Appendix E show how	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires making some assumptions. In the course of the preparation of the Memorial, we developed several alternative approaches, but each of these were ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for application. Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details of the daily flow record, and in fact, the results are very sensitive to the occurrence of errors or technical
	2But for any flow rate, the calculation requires3three steps.4Firstly, we calculate the firm power from5paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago.6Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is7equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate8divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the9number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver10firm power for the available flow rate. The daily11generating time gives a dispatch schedule.12We can then compute the pondage from the inflow13volume that can accumulate during the hours when the14plant is not operating.15The plant will store water for part of the day and16release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the17day.18The rest of the calculations in Appendix E show how19the maximum pondage can be determined from the full	 2 to say. 3 MR RAE: Okay. 4 So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does 5 assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow 6 volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred 7 or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. 8 (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create 9 various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires 10 making some assumptions. In the course of the 11 preparation of the Memorial, we developed several 12 alternative approaches, but each of these were 13 ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of 14 the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for 15 application. 16 Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details 17 of the daily flow record, and in fact, the results are 18 very sensitive to the occurrence of errors or technical 19 discrepancies in the hydrological record. I should note
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	2But for any flow rate, the calculation requires3three steps.4Firstly, we calculate the firm power from5paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago.6Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is7equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate8divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the9number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver10firm power for the available flow rate. The daily11generating time gives a dispatch schedule.12We can then compute the pondage from the inflow13volume that can accumulate during the hours when the14plant is not operating.15The plant will store water for part of the day and16release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the17day.18The rest of the calculations in Appendix E show how19the maximum pondage can be determined from the full20hydrological record. This can be done by simply	 2 to say. 3 MR RAE: Okay. 4 So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does 5 assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow 6 volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred 7 or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. 8 (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create 9 various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires 10 making some assumptions. In the course of the 11 preparation of the Memorial, we developed several 12 alternative approaches, but each of these were 13 ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of 14 the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for 15 application. 16 Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details 17 of the daily flow record, and in fact, the results are 18 very sensitive to the occurrence of errors or technical 19 discrepancies in the hydrological record. I should note 20 that in my experience, there are always errors in
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	2But for any flow rate, the calculation requires3three steps.4Firstly, we calculate the firm power from5paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago.6Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is7equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate8divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the9number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver10firm power for the available flow rate. The daily11generating time gives a dispatch schedule.12We can then compute the pondage from the inflow13volume that can accumulate during the hours when the14plant is not operating.15The plant will store water for part of the day and16release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the17day.18The rest of the calculations in Appendix E show how19hydrological record. This can be done by simply20hydrological record. This can be done by simply21repeating the calculation described here for each day of	 2 to say. 3 MR RAE: Okay. 4 So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does 5 assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow 6 volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred 7 or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. 8 (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create 9 various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires 10 making some assumptions. In the course of the 11 preparation of the Memorial, we developed several 12 alternative approaches, but each of these were 13 ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of 14 the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for 15 application. 16 Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details 17 of the daily flow record, and in fact, the results are 18 very sensitive to the occurrence of errors or technical 19 discrepancies in the hydrological record. I should note 20 that in my experience, there are always errors in 21 a hydrological record, despite the best efforts of data
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	2But for any flow rate, the calculation requires3three steps.4Firstly, we calculate the firm power from5paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago.6Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is7equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate8divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the9number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver10firm power for the available flow rate. The daily11generating time gives a dispatch schedule.12We can then compute the pondage from the inflow13volume that can accumulate during the hours when the14plant is not operating.15The plant will store water for part of the day and16release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the17day.18The rest of the calculations in Appendix E show how19hydrological record. This can be done by simply20repeating the calculation described here for each day of21the hydrologic record, which we had done; or by using	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires making some assumptions. In the course of the preparation of the Memorial, we developed several alternative approaches, but each of these were ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for application. Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details of the daily flow record, and in fact, the results are very sensitive to the occurrence of errors or technical discrepancies in the hydrological record. I should note that in my experience, there are always errors in a hydrological record, despite the best efforts of data collection, analysis and quality control.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	2But for any flow rate, the calculation requires3three steps.4Firstly, we calculate the firm power from5paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago.6Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is7equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate8divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the9number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver10firm power for the available flow rate. The daily11generating time gives a dispatch schedule.12We can then compute the pondage from the inflow13volume that can accumulate during the hours when the14plant is not operating.15The plant will store water for part of the day and16release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the17day.18The rest of the calculations in Appendix E show how19hydrological record. This can be done by simply21repeating the calculation described here for each day of22the hydrologic record, which we had done; or by using23the analytical method that we present in Appendix E,	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires making some assumptions. In the course of the preparation of the Memorial, we developed several alternative approaches, but each of these were ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for application. Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details of the daily flow record, and in fact, the results are very sensitive to the occurrence of errors or technical discrepancies in the hydrological record. I should note that in my experience, there are always errors in a hydrological record, despite the best efforts of data collection, analysis and quality control. India and the Baglihar Neutral Expert have used very
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2But for any flow rate, the calculation requires3three steps.4Firstly, we calculate the firm power from5paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago.6Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is7equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate8divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the9number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver10firm power for the available flow rate. The daily11generating time gives a dispatch schedule.12We can then compute the pondage from the inflow13volume that can accumulate during the hours when the14plant is not operating.15The plant will store water for part of the day and16release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the17day.18The rest of the calculations in Appendix E show how19the maximum pondage can be determined from the full10hydrological record. This can be done by simply21repeating the calculation described here for each day of22the hydrologic record, which we had done; or by using23the analytical method that we present in Appendix E,24which eliminates most of the computational effort.	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires making some assumptions. In the course of the preparation of the Memorial, we developed several alternative approaches, but each of these were ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for application. Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details of the daily flow record, and in fact, the results are very sensitive to the occurrence of errors or technical discrepancies in the hydrological record. I should note that in my experience, there are always errors in a hydrological record, despite the best efforts of data collection, analysis and quality control. India and the Baglihar Neutral Expert have used very simplified versions of the analysis that I'm going to
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2But for any flow rate, the calculation requires3three steps.4Firstly, we calculate the firm power from5paragraph 2(i), as we discussed a few minutes ago.6Then we compute a daily peaking time. And this is7equal to the volume for the day at the actual flow rate8divided by the minimum mean discharge. This gives the9number of hours that the plant can operate to deliver10firm power for the available flow rate. The daily11generating time gives a dispatch schedule.12We can then compute the pondage from the inflow13volume that can accumulate during the hours when the14plant is not operating.15The plant will store water for part of the day and16release at the firm power rate for the remainder of the17day.18The rest of the calculations in Appendix E show how19hydrological record. This can be done by simply21repeating the calculation described here for each day of22the hydrologic record, which we had done; or by using23the analytical method that we present in Appendix E,	 to say. MR RAE: Okay. So any other extension to a seven-day cycle does assume some aggregation and rescheduling of the flow volume for the period, with the criteria being inferred or assumed, rather than explicitly stated in the Treaty. (Slide 21) So that said, we can actually create various seven-day cycles, but each of these requires making some assumptions. In the course of the preparation of the Memorial, we developed several alternative approaches, but each of these were ultimately rejected as being unsupported by the terms of the Treaty or being so complex as to be impractical for application. Most of the approaches also rely heavily on details of the daily flow record, and in fact, the results are very sensitive to the occurrence of errors or technical discrepancies in the hydrological record. I should note that in my experience, there are always errors in a hydrological record, despite the best efforts of data collection, analysis and quality control. India and the Baglihar Neutral Expert have used very

16:50 1	periods of time. But in all cases, Pakistan assumes	16:54 1	and from that we calculate the daily generating hours
2	that the power is being dispatched at the firm power and	2	using those seven-day flow volumes and the minimum mean
3	not at the installed capacity. And this is the major	3	discharge. The daily generating hours are assumed to be
4	point of difference from the methods proposed by India	4	the same for each of the seven days, which introduces
5	or the result given by the Baglihar Neutral Expert.	5	a significant assumption into the calculation.
6	I would note that the Treaty does not make any	6	(Slide 23) So if I go on to see what it looks like.
7	provision for the installed capacity in paragraph 8 of	7	This figure shows an example of a typical week. And of
8	Annexure D, or for that matter in paragraph 15. The	8	course we have many, many weeks that can be displayed,
9	only reference is to secondary power, which is not	9	but this is a typical one.
10	linked to the computation of pondage. And for Treaty	10	Just to explain what we're looking at here and
11	interpretation, I'll refer this to Dr Miles tomorrow.	11	I regret that the mouse doesn't work more quickly the
12	But any of the alternatives that I'm going to	12	orange line shows the variation of pondage through the
13	illustrate are working drafts that are only to	13	week, which reads off the axis on the right-hand side.
14	illustrate the concepts developed and some of the	14	The blue line shows the variability of the natural
15	difficulties that we experienced. But we have developed	15	inflow from day to day, and you can see here an example
16	the concepts sufficiently to illustrate how the criteria	16	where the flow more or less doubled from Thursday to
17	in the Treaty may affect their computation and any	17	Friday. And the grey lines show the dispatch of the
18	supplementary assumptions that were needed, sensitivity	18	power station at the firm power, or what's shown here is
19	to data, and the uncertainty of the results coming out	19	the minimum mean discharge amount.
20	of it.	20	So the pondage calculations are performed each day.
21	So looking at it, alternatives fall into three main	21	But when we go through this, depending on the timing of
22	categories. And there are sub-variants within these,	22	the flow rate, the actual flow, you can have negative
23	but I'm not going to go through all the sub-variants.	23	periods of pondage very early in the programme or you
24	The first is scheduling arising from the application of	24	can have periods when the pondage becomes negative
25	paragraph 8(c) alone; the second is when we combine 8(c)	25	partway through the week. So you have to do the
	Page 93		Page 95
16:52 1	with paragraph 15; and the third is something where	16:55 1	calculation once and then reset the storage condition at
2	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve.	2	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same
2 3	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may	2 3	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you
2 3 4	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're	2 3 4	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic.
2 3 4 5	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power,	2 3 4 5	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in
2 3 4 5 6	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only	2 3 4 5 6	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days
2 3 4 5 6 7	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the	2 3 4 5 6 7	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows is important, and you've got to consider them all if 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through spreadsheets, so that I can do it reasonably quickly,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows is important, and you've got to consider them all if you're going to determine whether there's a maximum of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through spreadsheets, so that I can do it reasonably quickly, but it still involves analysis.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows is important, and you've got to consider them all if you're going to determine whether there's a maximum of power involved. This can be reduced by only selecting 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through spreadsheets, so that I can do it reasonably quickly, but it still involves analysis. (Slide 24) When it comes to the result, what we get
$ \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 refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows is important, and you've got to consider them all if you're going to determine whether there's a maximum of power involved. This can be reduced by only selecting 	$ \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 beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through spreadsheets, so that I can do it reasonably quickly, but it still involves analysis. (Slide 24) When it comes to the result, what we get from it is the relationship between 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\end{array} $	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows is important, and you've got to consider them all if you're going to determine whether there's a maximum of power involved. This can be reduced by only selecting periods in the dry season, but that reduces the number by about half. In practice, what we have done is set up 	$ \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 beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through spreadsheets, so that I can do it reasonably quickly, but it still involves analysis. (Slide 24) When it comes to the result, what we get from it is the relationship between the amount of pondage required and the average flow rate in any
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows is important, and you've got to consider them all if you're going to determine whether there's a maximum of power involved. This can be reduced by only selecting periods in the dry season, but that reduces the number by about half. In practice, what we have done is set up a series of macros, working in spreadsheets, to process 	$ \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 beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through spreadsheets, so that I can do it reasonably quickly, but it still involves analysis. (Slide 24) When it comes to the result, what we get from it is the relationship between the amount of pondage required and the average flow rate in any period. And this figure actually illustrates one 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} $	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows is important, and you've got to consider them all if you're going to determine whether there's a maximum of power involved. This can be reduced by only selecting periods in the dry season, but that reduces the number by about half. In practice, what we have done is set up a series of macros, working in spreadsheets, to process 	$ \begin{array}{c} 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 beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through spreadsheets, so that I can do it reasonably quickly, but it still involves analysis. (Slide 24) When it comes to the result, what we get from it is the relationship between the amount of pondage required and the average flow rate in any period. And this figure actually illustrates one of the difficulties with the approach, and that is: we 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} $	 we refer only to the use of a load duration curve. (Slide 22) So in the first of these options I may be repetitive, but I'm going to say again that we're doing the daily peaking to generate at the firm power, and the idea is to create a weekly schedule using only paragraph 8(c) with the actual flow data. So the methodology we developed involves selecting seven-day sequences from the daily hydrological record. However, this requires that the record is screened to select all periods with at least some time below the minimum mean discharge. If you look at the whole year, you've got 358 possible seven-day sequences. Because if you capture each seven days, you only move one day at a time as you go to the next sequence. The sequence of flows is important, and you've got to consider them all if you're going to determine whether there's a maximum of power involved. This can be reduced by only selecting periods in the dry season, but that reduces the number by about half. In practice, what we have done is set up a series of macros, working in spreadsheets, to process the data and select the periods. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\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 beginning, so that your pondage ends up at the same at the beginning and the end of the period, or else you end up with negative values which are not realistic. So in doing the analysis, the pondage is computed in all of the weeks, even if we have abnormally low days within the weeks. And this means that the record can't exclude any of the weeks simply because they have an average less than the minimum mean discharge. You may have low flows at the beginning of a week that would require pondage, so we had to compute all of those as well. I say that just to note that the analysis involves a large number of computations to arrive at the daily loading analysis and the associated pondage. And we have the opportunity, now that we can run this through spreadsheets, so that I can do it reasonably quickly, but it still involves analysis. (Slide 24) When it comes to the result, what we get from it is the relationship between the amount of pondage required and the average flow rate in any period. And this figure actually illustrates one of the difficulties with the approach, and that is: we have a whole series of values here which are very suspect.

16:57	1	pondage, it gives a curve which follows these data and	17:00 1	development of this method would be more complex than
10.57	2	then loops around this way to zero. But it follows as	2	what I've described above or previously for the weekly
	3	a lower bound to those data, the lower part.	3	computation using paragraph 8(c) alone.
	4	But during analysis and examination of the results,	4	(Slide 26) So going to paragraph 15, we have the
	5	the higher pondage values were generally found to be	5	operational requirements for flow balance. And
	6	caused by suspect data in the hydrological record.	6	paragraph 15 does not refer to pondage but it does give
	7	These are values that became abnormally low or	7	flow balances. The overall requirement is a balance
	8	abnormally high within the record, that then skewed the	8	within a seven-day period. And this overriding
		results and resulted in these what I consider as	8 9	constraint applies to any location.
	9			
	10	outliers.	10	The second group of constraints is that the flow on
	11	To go through the analysis, the scattered values	11	any day must be within minimum and maximum limits that
	12	would have to be rejected as being unlikely to be valid.	12	are computed for that day. And these limits are imposed
	13	But it requires corrections in the hydrologic record and	13	on the 24-hour flow volume, and not on any average daily
	14	quality control review, which is not within Pakistan's	14	flow volume. And the daily flow limits vary depending
	15	authority under the Treaty. We are given the data;	15	on the location of the power plant.
	16	we are not able to correct it and screen it for quality	16	(Slide 27) Application of this method by the
	17	control. The process of screening at this level becomes	17	Baglihar Neutral Expert and by India uses the average
	18	subjective, which adds another level of uncertainty to	18	flow through the seven days to give a weekly flow
	19	the analysis.	19	balance. This is illustrated in this slide, which
	20	So, in summary, we have a process of selecting	20	compares the cumulative inflow with the cumulative
	21	periods, coming to weekly distribution of the energy or	21	outflow. So effectively, anywhere on the curve, if you
	22	flow rate, computation of the pondage, and then the	22	reference the curve, it will give you the volume that
	23	adjustment of the pondage so that we never go to	23	you have accumulated by any particular day of the week.
	24	a negative value in between. And there are, ultimately,	24	When we look at the terms of paragraph 15, that
	25	thousands of individual calculations which are done in	25	requires, at a limit, not less than whether 30% or 50%
		Page 97		Page 99
16:59	1	macros within a spreadsheet.	17:02 1	of the flow on some of the days and 130% on the other.
16:59	1 2	macros within a spreadsheet. We believe the method has several fatal flaws that	17:02 1 2	And if you take these two rates in combination, you
16:59		We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that		And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which
16:59	2	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that	2	And if you take these two rates in combination, you
16:59	2 3	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective.	2 3	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which
16:59	2 3 4	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the	2 3 4	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally
	2 3 4 5	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of	2 3 4 5	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is
	2 3 4 5 6	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the	2 3 4 5 6	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days.
	2 3 4 5 6 7	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned,	2 3 4 5 6 7	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is
1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making
1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the
1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15.
1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can
1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must be within 130% and 50% or 130% and 30%, depending on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very simplified version where I have taken the approach of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must be within 130% and 50% or 130% and 30%, depending on the location in the watershed. But this variation is balanced on the daily flow; it's not variation on	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very simplified version where I have taken the approach of looking at the average flow, knowing that it's not correct according to the interpretation that we make.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must be within 130% and 50% or 130% and 30%, depending on the location in the watershed. But this variation is balanced on the daily flow; it's not variation on an average flow. And that detail would add significant	$ \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 if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very simplified version where I have taken the approach of looking at the average flow, knowing that it's not correct according to the interpretation that we make. So the flow can be developed as a function of flow
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must be within 130% and 50% or 130% and 30%, depending on the location in the watershed. But this variation is balanced on the daily flow; it's not variation on an average flow. And that detail would add significant complexity to any computation.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very simplified version where I have taken the approach of looking at the average flow, knowing that it's not correct according to the interpretation that we make. So the flow can be developed as a function of flow rate, as we did in the previous alternative, and this is
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must be within 130% and 50% or 130% and 30%, depending on the location in the watershed. But this variation is balanced on the daily flow; it's not variation on an average flow. And that detail would add significant complexity to any computation. What I am presenting for you here is a significant	$ \begin{array}{c} 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 if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very simplified version where I have taken the approach of looking at the average flow, knowing that it's not correct according to the interpretation that we make. So the flow can be developed as a function of flow rate, as we did in the previous alternative, and this is one of the outputs. The daily generation time varies
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must be within 130% and 50% or 130% and 30%, depending on the location in the watershed. But this variation is balanced on the daily flow; it's not variation on an average flow. And that detail would add significant complexity to any computation. What I am presenting for you here is a significant simplification of the concept that I used as	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very simplified version where I have taken the approach of looking at the average flow, knowing that it's not correct according to the interpretation that we make. So the flow can be developed as a function of flow rate, as we did in the previous alternative, and this is one of the outputs. The daily generation time varies between the Saturday and Monday period. So you see
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must be within 130% and 50% or 130% and 30%, depending on the location in the watershed. But this variation is balanced on the daily flow; it's not variation on an average flow. And that detail would add significant complexity to any computation. What I am presenting for you here is a significant	$ \begin{array}{c} 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 if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very simplified version where I have taken the approach of looking at the average flow, knowing that it's not correct according to the interpretation that we make. So the flow can be developed as a function of flow rate, as we did in the previous alternative, and this is one of the outputs. The daily generation time varies
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We believe the method has several fatal flaws that make it unacceptable for application. The first is that it's very sensitive to data errors, and screening-out of the erroneous results is time-consuming and subjective. The Treaty does not provide any criterion supporting the equal daily firm power periods. And the assumption of average flow rate for the week is not supported by any provision in the Treaty. And again, as I mentioned, there's significant computational effort. (Slide 25) We did look at a second method, which is trying to combine paragraph 8(c) and paragraph 15. And paragraph 15 requires that the flow volume received in any seven-day period be released within that same period. But a second requirement and I think it's a very important one is that the flow volume on any day must be within 130% and 50% or 130% and 30%, depending on the location in the watershed. But this variation is balanced on the daily flow; it's not variation on an average flow. And that detail would add significant complexity to any computation. What I am presenting for you here is a significant simplification of the concept that I used as	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	And if you take these two rates in combination, you would get the red curve shown below here, which effectively divides the period into what is nominally weekends versus weekdays, even though the weekend is a little over two days. But the flow rate here is indicated by the slope of the lines, and then the curve is showing the volume. The inflow, the blue line, is uniform in the assumption that has been made by the Neutral Expert. And this is the key difficulty with the analysis: you're making an assumption of uniformity, rather than using the actual daily flows implied by paragraph 15. (Slide 28) Now, if we ignore that difficulty, we can make a weekly schedule to assign the generating hours to the flow volumes available from the paragraph 15 flow balance. Now, what I'm showing here is a very, very simplified version where I have taken the approach of looking at the average flow, knowing that it's not correct according to the interpretation that we make. So the flow can be developed as a function of flow rate, as we did in the previous alternative, and this is one of the outputs. The daily generation time varies between the Saturday and Monday period. So you see

17:04 1	Saturday, Sunday and a shorter time period on Monday,	17:07 1	And if we're imposing the actual daily flow data,
2	here (indicating). The remainder of the week, which is	2	we would find that it is again extremely sensitive to
3	the weekdays arising out of the previous slide, gets	3	potential discrepancies in the hydrologic record, in the
4	at this particular flow rate, it's operating at the full	4	same way it was in the previous example I gave.
5	firm power or minimum mean discharge amount.	5	On reflection of the difficulties involved, this
6	If I were to show you a lower flow rate, what you	6	approach was dropped before being fully developed. The
7	would see is that the Tuesday to Friday generating	7	combination of its complexity and potential subjectivity
8	periods would become less than 24 hours, but they would	8	in the face of data errors made any possible result
9	also be capped at the firm power; but there would still	9	suspect.
10	be generation on the Saturday, Sunday, Monday.	10	(Slide 30) So I come to another completely different
11	(Slide 29) But in the method, the pondage will	11	approach, and that's that pondage can also be derived
12	invariably reach a maximum at the end of the weekend,	12	directly from the daily load duration curve, although
13	which is the point where it's the peak here. That will	13	this would be done for a daily analysis.
14	invariably be the maximum pondage during the week,	14	The analysis would adopt a load duration curve,
15	unless there is some extraordinary error in the	15	illustrated here as the orange line, and it shows simply
16	hydrology. So the pondage accumulates through the	16	the percentage of time that the power exceeds a certain
17	weekend, reaches the maximum, and then declines through the rest of the week as the water is drawn from storage.	17	amount. So the power on the left-hand axis, the
18	C C	18	vertical axis, and the percentage of time on the
19 20	Recall again that this is done with a uniform flow. (Slide 30) What I show here in these curves is how	19 20	horizontal axis. And the orange curve at any point
20 21	the result of this very simplified case would come if	20 21	shows the percentage of time that the power is exceeded. The area under this curve is equal to the energy.
21 22	you don't consider the actual daily flow data. The	21	So the methodology using a load duration curve is
22	weekly inflow is assumed to be uniform, and the number	22 23	that we locate the position of a plant's firm power and
23 24	of hours is then determined with the firm power	23 24	firm energy within the load duration curve so that both
24 25	according to the minimum mean discharge. It gives	24	elements are fully used. And this process is referred
23	according to the minimum mean discharge. It gives	2.5	clements are fully used. And uns process is referred
	Page 101		Page 103
17:06 1	an amount of pondaga, which is an outcome of the	17.00 1	to as "stacking", where each plant is assigned to the
17:06 1	an amount of pondage, which is an outcome of the	17:09 1	to as "stacking", where each plant is assigned to the
2	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest	2	load duration curve to meet the overall demand.
2 3	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered	2 3	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had
2 3 4	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here.	2 3 4	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant,
2 3 4 5	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that	2 3 4 5	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would
2 3 4 5 6	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so	2 3 4 5 6	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that
2 3 4 5 6 7	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour	2 3 4 5 6 7	 load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the	2 3 4 5 6 7	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ \end{array} $	 load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ \end{array} $	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago. Again, you have over 300 possible seven-day periods within each year, and the computation requires the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper position, you need pondage. And in doing this analysis,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago. Again, you have over 300 possible seven-day periods within each year, and the computation requires the paragraph 15 limits to be considered before coming 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} $	 load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper position, you need pondage. And in doing this analysis, the observation is that if I took that original slice
$ \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} $	 operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago. Again, you have over 300 possible seven-day periods within each year, and the computation requires the paragraph 15 limits to be considered before coming to the generation time on a daily basis. Having made 	$ \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} $	 load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper position, you need pondage. And in doing this analysis, the observation is that if I took that original slice and just moved it up, then the area of that slice
$ \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} $	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago. Again, you have over 300 possible seven-day periods within each year, and the computation requires the paragraph 15 limits to be considered before coming to the generation time on a daily basis. Having made a balance, the timing of the generation would also 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} $	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper position, you need pondage. And in doing this analysis, the observation is that if I took that original slice and just moved it up, then the area of that slice sitting to the right side of the load duration curve is
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago. Again, you have over 300 possible seven-day periods within each year, and the computation requires the paragraph 15 limits to be considered before coming to the generation time on a daily basis. Having made a balance, the timing of the generation would also be computed, and the whole result is then recomputed 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\end{array} $	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper position, you need pondage. And in doing this analysis, the observation is that if I took that original slice and just moved it up, then the area of that slice sitting to the right side of the load duration curve is equal to the amount of energy storage I need in order to
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago. Again, you have over 300 possible seven-day periods within each year, and the computation requires the paragraph 15 limits to be considered before coming to the generation time on a daily basis. Having made a balance, the timing of the generation would also be computed, and the whole result is then recomputed with the pondage to ensure that you're not creating negative 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper position, you need pondage. And in doing this analysis, the observation is that if I took that original slice and just moved it up, then the area of that slice sitting to the right side of the load duration curve is equal to the amount of energy storage I need in order to place it under the load duration 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} $	 operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago. Again, you have over 300 possible seven-day periods within each year, and the computation requires the paragraph 15 limits to be considered before coming to the generation time on a daily basis. Having made a balance, the timing of the generation would also be computed, and the whole result is then recomputed 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\end{array} $	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper position, you need pondage. And in doing this analysis, the observation is that if I took that original slice and just moved it up, then the area of that slice sitting to the right side of the load duration curve is equal to the amount of energy storage I need in order to
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper position, you need pondage. And in doing this analysis, the observation is that if I took that original slice and just moved it up, then the area of that slice sitting to the right side of the load duration curve is equal to the amount of energy storage I need in order to place it under the load duration curve. I know it's a bit complicated, but the geometry
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 operating criteria in paragraph 15. But the biggest difficulty is that the daily flow rate is not considered in the simplified version I demonstrate here. If we were going to adhere to paragraph 15, that would require that we include the daily flow rates so that we can test the flow variability of each 24-hour period within the constraints in paragraph 15. And if the actual data values were used, then we would have the same or more difficulty as identified for the previous alternatives. We would need to compute the pondage for each possible seven-day period within the generation duration, varying the time depending on the seven-day flow balance as well as the individual daily flow bounds. And this added complexity became somewhat intractable when I was going through these analyses some months ago. Again, you have over 300 possible seven-day periods within each year, and the computation requires the paragraph 15 limits to be considered before coming to the generation time on a daily basis. Having made a balance, the timing of the generation would also be computed, and the whole result is then recomputed with the pondage to ensure that you're not creating negative 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 load duration curve to meet the overall demand. Looking at the bottom, this bottom bar, if I had a certain amount of energy available from the plant, I could distribute it through 24 hours, and that would give me a certain amount of power required to give that distribution. If that power is less than the firm power, then we won't have made the best use of that available capability. The optimum position is to locate the place closer to the top, as I illustrate here (indicating), where the blue area underneath the curve, bound by this line, is equal to the energy available across the bottom; and at the same time, the power available on the left side is equal to the firm power. So we take advantage of both firm power and energy by locating its position within the load duration curve. But in order to do that placing at that upper position, you need pondage. And in doing this analysis, the observation is that if I took that original slice and just moved it up, then the area of that slice sitting to the right side of the load duration curve is equal to the amount of energy storage I need in order to place it under the load duration curve.

17:10 1	works. And the objective here is to find a combination	17:13 1	of them requires some assumptions that are not
2	where you can make full use of the power and the energy,	2	
3	which is the area under the curve, and you just find	3	
4	where you are in the load duration curve to take	4	
4 5	advantage of both components of that.	4	
5	We note that the position where the plant will stack	5	
8 7	in the load duration curve will vary as a function of	7	-
8	the flow rate. The lowest flow condition has the least	8	
8 9	energy, and therefore will stack high in the load	8 9	
9 10	duration curve. As the flow volume increases, the plant	9 10	
10	stacks progressively lower until the plant becomes	10	
11	baseload: it's available 24 hours.	11	
12	The approach can be set out analytically based on	12	1 · · ·
13	the characteristics of any power station and the load	13	
14	duration curve. And we've gone through this process,	14	-
15	and several observations of the methodology include	15	
10	that: the method is computationally sparse, it doesn't	10	
18	require a lot of data handling or a lot of separate	17	
18	computations; the maximum pondage is computed directly	18	
20	from the minimum mean discharge or firm power, as we do	20	
20	it with no other inputs; and there's no other	20	
21	assumptions required, other than information	21	
22	specifically given in the Treaty.	22	
23	It provides firm power on any day, with the number	23	
24	of hours of generation depending on the actual flow	25	
-			
	Page 105		Page 107
17:12 1	rate. The maximum pondage would, however, be large	17:15 1	sufficiently so that the results could be identified.
17:12 1 2	rate. The maximum pondage would, however, be large enough to enable production of firm power regardless of	17:15 1 2	sufficiently so that the results could be identified. But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to
			-
2	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of	2	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to
2 3	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive	2 3	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation
2 3 4	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the	2 3 4 5 6	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being
2 3 4 5	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive	2 3 4 5 6 7	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external
2 3 4 5 6	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's an illustration of the fact that there are other bases	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind going back to your previous slide, I think on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's an illustration of the fact that there are other bases for this calculation that are also useful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind going back to your previous slide, I think on MR RAE: This one (slide 30)?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's an illustration of the fact that there are other bases for this calculation that are also useful. (Slide 31) So to summarise on question 20(b), there 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind going back to your previous slide, I think on MR RAE: This one (slide 30)? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, here.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's an illustration of the fact that there are other bases for this calculation that are also useful. (Slide 31) So to summarise on question 20(b), there are other variants of the seven-day alternatives that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind going back to your previous slide, I think on MR RAE: This one (slide 30)? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, here. So you present there the upper blue bar, which 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} $	 enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's an illustration of the fact that there are other bases for this calculation that are also useful. (Slide 31) So to summarise on question 20(b), there are other variants of the seven-day alternatives that I've discussed that might be available. And certainly 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind going back to your previous slide, I think on MR RAE: This one (slide 30)? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, here. So you present there the upper blue bar, which you called the "stored energy". Could you elaborate how
$ \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} $	 enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's an illustration of the fact that there are other bases for this calculation that are also useful. (Slide 31) So to summarise on question 20(b), there are other variants of the seven-day alternatives that I've discussed that might be available. And certainly to develop the combination of 8(c) and 15, we would have 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind going back to your previous slide, I think on MR RAE: This one (slide 30)? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, here. So you present there the upper blue bar, which you called the "stored energy". Could you elaborate how that energy is being calculated?
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's an illustration of the fact that there are other bases for this calculation that are also useful. (Slide 31) So to summarise on question 20(b), there are other variants of the seven-day alternatives that I've discussed that might be available. And certainly to develop the combination of 8(c) and 15, we would have to be developing a variant where we include the daily 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind going back to your previous slide, I think on MR RAE: This one (slide 30)? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, here. So you present there the upper blue bar, which you called the "stored energy". Could you elaborate how that energy is being calculated? MR RAE: The calculation of the energy is from whatever 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} $	 enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's an illustration of the fact that there are other bases for this calculation that are also useful. (Slide 31) So to summarise on question 20(b), there are other variants of the seven-day alternatives that I've discussed that might be available. And certainly to develop the combination of 8(c) and 15, we would have to be developing a variant where we include the daily flows and the variability of the daily flows: that's 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind going back to your previous slide, I think on MR RAE: This one (slide 30)? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, here. So you present there the upper blue bar, which you called the "stored energy". Could you elaborate how that energy is being calculated? MR RAE: The calculation of the energy is from whatever flow rate is available in the river on that day.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 enough to enable production of firm power regardless of the actual flow rate, so any flow could be served. It's not sensitive to hydrological data discrepancies or errors. And the result, interestingly, is not sensitive to the shape of the load duration curve because the plants being considered are small relative to the system load. This methodology was known at the time the Treaty was prepared, and descriptions of elements of this are given in the text by Creager and Justin and contemporaneous references. But most interestingly the pondage provided by this method reduces to exactly the same analytical result as we've derived from the analysis presented by Pakistan in our Memorial. It's not a weekly scheduling, but it's an illustration of the fact that there are other bases for this calculation that are also useful. (Slide 31) So to summarise on question 20(b), there are other variants of the seven-day alternatives that I've discussed that might be available. And certainly to develop the combination of 8(c) and 15, we would have to be developing a variant where we include the daily 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But none of these schemes was ultimately considered to be correct, because of both the lack of sufficient support in the Treaty and because of the complexity involved. After review, the Pakistan calculation presented in the Memorial was selected as being compliant with the Treaty, not requiring any external information or assumptions, and being straightforward to apply. That brings me to the end of my prepared notes. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Rae. Let me turn to my colleagues. I have Professor Buytaert first, and then Mr Minear. (5.16 pm) Questions from THE COURT PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Would you mind going back to your previous slide, I think on MR RAE: This one (slide 30)? PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, here. So you present there the upper blue bar, which you called the "stored energy". Could you elaborate how that energy is being calculated? MR RAE: The calculation of the energy is from whatever flow

17:16 1	MR RAE: Yes.	17:19 1	come back to recombine them.
2	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay.	2	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you.
3	MR RAE: You can do this daily, weekly, monthly, whichever	3	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear.
4	one is convenient. If you do it weekly, you end up with	4	MR MINEAR: Mr Rae, thank you. I want to go back just to
5	a volume which is the total volume for the week, which	5	make sure I have a good understanding of the position
6	you then divide per day for pondage. But it's the flow	6	that's stated in the Memorial as compared to India's
7	rate in the day times the number of hours in the period	7	very different position.
8	gives you the energy.	8	I take it as a starting point that we have pondage
9	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.	9	because of weekly and daily variations in load because
10	As a quick follow-up I know you've had very	10	we live lifecycles that reflect that: we get up in the
11	little time to prepare this: we very much appreciate	11	morning, we go to work, we come home daily. Some of us
12	that you went into so much detail but would there be	12	get the time off on the weekend; obviously not
13	an opportunity of combining your method 2, which applies	13	Pakistan's legal team this week!
14	the constraints of a 30% and a 130%, and allows for some	14	But those are concerns for a person who is operating
15	form of carry-forward during the weekend, with this	15	a hydropower plant. And they can take advantage of that
16	method?	16	by stacking up pondage on the low-use weekends to use
17	MR RAE: That would be entering into a lot more complexity.	17	during the high-peak demands during the middle of the
18	And when we do this sort of analysis, we typically do it	18	week. That's basically accepted, right? Am
19	for a planning period over longer terms. To try to	19	I describing the basic situation for an operational
20	create the complexity of dealing with the load duration	20	engineer correctly?
21	on weekends versus weekdays would have the same	21	MR RAE: That is one possible use of pondage. But keep in
22	difficulties, I think, as the other approach.	22	mind, as we look at the spectrum of run-of-river
23	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But assuming under, for example,	23	projects or hydropower projects generally, we go from
24	method 2 that you have some idea of the weekly	24	projects which have zero pondage: basically, the water
25	variation between weekdays and weekends, it doesn't seem	25	level must be kept constant. And typical of those would
	Page 109		Page 111
	Fage 107		Fage 111
17:18 1	to be too difficult to take this stored energy,	17:20 1	be projects on the Ohio River or the Mississippi, where
17:18 1 2	calculated obviously for the entire week, and then	17:20 1 2	be projects on the Ohio River or the Mississippi, where navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and
	calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used		navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down.
2 3 4	calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2.	2 3 4	navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this,
2 3	calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the	2 3	navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down.MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear.
2 3 4 5 6	calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process,	2 3 4 5 6	navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down.MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear.Just the general principle of pondage is that's
2 3 4 5 6 7	calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2.MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly	2 3 4 5 6 7	navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down.MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear.Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2.MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have a daily analysis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have a daily analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in your method 2. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have a daily analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project falls on that spectrum.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in your method 2. MR RAE: What you're talking of doing though is splitting 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project falls on that spectrum. MR MINEAR: Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in your method 2. MR RAE: What you're talking of doing though is splitting the weekdays and weekends. Each will have their own 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project falls on that spectrum. MR RAE: Sure. MR RAE: And it's still useful in between. And this is part
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in your method 2. MR RAE: What you're talking of doing though is splitting the weekdays and weekends. Each will have their own pondage. But then trying to unify those back together 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have a daily analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project falls on that spectrum. MR RAE: And it's still useful in between. And this is part of what I put in my presentation last week: that the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in your method 2. MR RAE: What you're talking of doing though is splitting the weekdays and weekends. Each will have their own 	$ \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} $	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have a daily analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project falls on that spectrum. MR RAE: Sure. MR RAE: And it's still useful in between. And this is part of what I put in my presentation last week: that the pondage is still being used in the power system. 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} $	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in your method 2. MR RAE: What you're talking of doing though is splitting the weekdays and weekends. Each will have their own pondage. But then trying to unify those back together in a maximum pondage permissible is where the problem would come. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have a daily analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project falls on that spectrum. MR RAE: And it's still useful in between. And this is part of what I put in my presentation last week: that the pondage is still being used in the power system. So it's still useful, no matter what the amount is: it's
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in your method 2. MR RAE: What you're talking of doing though is splitting the weekdays and weekends. Each will have their own pondage. But then trying to unify those back together in a maximum pondage permissible is where the problem 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have a daily analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project falls on that spectrum. MR RAE: Sure. MR RAE: And it's still useful in between. And this is part of what I put in my presentation last week: that the pondage is still being used in the power system. So
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in your method 2. MR RAE: What you're talking of doing though is splitting the weekdays and weekends. Each will have their own pondage. But then trying to unify those back together in a maximum pondage permissible is where the problem would come. You can certainly split the load duration curve and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have a daily analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project falls on that spectrum. MR RAE: And it's still useful in between. And this is part of what I put in my presentation last week: that the pondage is still being used in the power system. So it's still useful, no matter what the amount is: it's still generating benefits for the power 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} $	 calculated obviously for the entire week, and then redistribute it according to the data that you've used in your method 2. MR RAE: What I said was that when I go through the mathematics of this and create the analytical process, you end up with a computation which reduces to exactly the same equation that we have produced coming out of the analysis in the Memorial. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I guess only if you do it on a daily basis and don't carry over. So essentially, if you use the blue bar, essentially the energy, that's the potential energy that's available in the inflow. And if you carry that over in the way that you did in your method 2, you should be able to take into account or to address some of the weekly variations that you showed in your method 2. MR RAE: What you're talking of doing though is splitting the weekdays and weekends. Each will have their own pondage. But then trying to unify those back together in a maximum pondage permissible is where the problem would come. You can certainly split the load duration curve and done the analysis on their own, but each will show their 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 navigation rules and they're not able to operate up and down. MR MINEAR: Sure. I'm not trying to trip you up on this, just to be clear. Just the general principle of pondage is that's a practical concern for someone who's operating a hydropower plant: you can take advantage of the low usage during the weekend too. That's why the weekly loads are important, because you can take advantage of low usage on the weekend to, in essence, create more pondage to use during the peak days later in the week. MR RAE: Yes. What I wanted to say though is that we have a spectrum. And whether you're able to use it on a weekday/weekend analysis or you have a daily analysis or you have no pondage at all depends where your project falls on that spectrum. MR RAE: And it's still useful in between. And this is part of what I put in my presentation last week: that the pondage is still being used in the power system. But in principle, once you've computed the pondage,

17:22 1	definition of pondage and it tells you how you can	17:24 1	MR RAE: Yes.
2	use it. And it may be used weekly and daily.	2	MR MINEAR: I want to make sure that I understand that's
3	MR MINEAR: You're moving away from the point that I want to	3	your theory.
4	make, that I think you might agree with; but if you	4	MR RAE: So we calculate the amount of pondage; we then
5	don't, I'd like to know that as well.	5	double it. So they have a certain amount. And how they
6	But these considerations you're talking about now,	6	want to use it, if they want to hold it on the
7	and the general description of the use of pondage, are	7	Saturday/Sunday, subject to the limits on paragraph 15
8	matters that go to how one operates a plant, the person	8	that constrain that they can't go below 50% on the
9	who's actually in the plant operating it. But what	9	Chenab but anyway, subject to those limits, they can
10	we're concerned with in the Treaty is the calculation of	10	reorganise it any way they want.
11	maximum pondage based on a formula that's specified in	11	MR MINEAR: Yes.
12	the Treaty. And that definition is not looking to how	12	MR RAE: And it doesn't have to be you know, India has
13	you operate a plant: it's simply providing a number.	13	the flexibility. If, on a given day, they were able to
14	And the number is the same whether it's a Sunday, More than T_{res} day W_r days and have an element theory. It thinks	14	operate at firm power for three hours, and they decided,
15	Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, under your theory, I think.	15	"No, I don't want to do that; I want to operate at twice
16		16	the firm power for an hour and a half", they have the
17	MR MINEAR: But it's just a means for calculation, in the	17	flexibility to do that. It's not constrained.
18 19	same way that no one operates a plant 12 hours on, 12 hours off in that particular example you gave. They	18 19	But what is constrained is the original definition
19 20	might on a particular day, but it's a dynamic process in	19 20	of that volume. And once they've got that volume, the operator can make use of it as a characteristic of the
20 21			-
21 22	operating the plant day to day. And what the Treaty specifies is just a formula for calculating pondage,	21 22	plant. MR MINEAR: Okay, thank you.
22	which is not tied to how the operator is going to	22	THE CHAIRMAN: So, Mr Rae, you were involved in both the
23 24	operate the plant.	23 24	Baglihar proceeding and now in this proceeding, and it
24	Now, if I'm wrong about that, please let me know.	24 25	does strike me that there is a reasonable amount of
25	Now, if the wrong about that, prease let the know.	23	does strike me that there is a reasonable amount of
	Page 113		Page 115
17:23 1	MR RAE: No. I think you're right about that. And this is	17.26 1	difference between the approaches taken in the two
17:23 1 2	MR RAE: No, I think you're right about that. And this is the point we've been making, is that if we go into	17:26 1	difference between the approaches taken in the two proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is
2	the point we've been making, is that if we go into	2	proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is
	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria		**
2 3	the point we've been making, is that if we go into	2 3	proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk
2 3 4	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the	2 3 4	proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about.
2 3 4 5	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how	2 3 4 5	proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit
2 3 4 5 6	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one,	2 3 4 5 6	proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings
2 3 4 5 6 7	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which	2 3 4 5 6 7	proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with MR MINEAR: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm clear on your theory; I'm not endorsing your theory. But your theory 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process, what you see presented certainly in the determination
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with MR MINEAR: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm clear on your theory; I'm not endorsing your theory. But your theory doesn't need to consider a seven-day period for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process, what you see presented certainly in the determination and to some degree the documents submitted by Pakistan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with MR MINEAR: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm clear on your theory; I'm not endorsing your theory. But your theory doesn't need to consider a seven-day period for calculating pondage. It's calculating pondage according 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process, what you see presented certainly in the determination and to some degree the documents submitted by Pakistan after the first memorial were in some ways in response
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with MR MINEAR: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm clear on your theory; I'm not endorsing your theory. But your theory doesn't need to consider a seven-day period for calculating pondage. It's calculating pondage according to a theory and a formula 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} $	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process, what you see presented certainly in the determination and to some degree the documents submitted by Pakistan after the first memorial were in some ways in response to questions that the Neutral Expert was bringing up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with MR MINEAR: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm clear on your theory; I'm not endorsing your theory. But your theory doesn't need to consider a seven-day period for calculating pondage. It's calculating pondage according to a theory and a formula in the Treaty. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process, what you see presented certainly in the determination and to some degree the documents submitted by Pakistan after the first memorial were in some ways in response to questions that the Neutral Expert was bringing up through the process. And the process tended to take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with MR MINEAR: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm clear on your theory; I'm not endorsing your theory. But your theory doesn't need to consider a seven-day period for calculating pondage. It's calculating pondage according to a theory and a formula in the Treaty. MR MINEAR: Yes. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process, what you see presented certainly in the determination and to some degree the documents submitted by Pakistan after the first memorial were in some ways in response to questions that the Neutral Expert was bringing up through the process. And the process tended to take a life of its own and say, "Well, they want us to answer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with MR MINEAR: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm clear on your theory; I'm not endorsing your theory. But your theory doesn't need to consider a seven-day period for calculating pondage. It's calculating pondage according to a theory and a formula in the Treaty. MR MINEAR: Yes. MR MINEAR: And then there will be some operator who will decide how to utilise that pondage in actually operating 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process, what you see presented certainly in the determination and to some degree the documents submitted by Pakistan after the first memorial were in some ways in response to questions that the Neutral Expert was bringing up through the process. And the process tended to take a life of its own and say, "Well, they want us to answer that question, so let's build it that way".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with MR MINEAR: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm clear on your theory; I'm not endorsing your theory. But your theory doesn't need to consider a seven-day period for calculating pondage. It's calculating pondage according to a theory and a formula in the Treaty. MR MINEAR: Yes. MR MINEAR: And then there will be some operator who will decide how to utilise that pondage in actually operating 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process, what you see presented certainly in the determination and to some degree the documents submitted by Pakistan after the first memorial were in some ways in response to questions that the Neutral Expert was bringing up through the process. And the process tended to take a life of its own and say, "Well, they want us to answer that question, so let's build it that way".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the point we've been making, is that if we go into paragraph 8 of Annexure D, it gives us design criteria and we're able to design a plant, but then the plant is able to be operated however it's convenient to the operator in India to do that. And its definition of how it's operated is in paragraph 2; I forget which one, I'm sorry. But there's a definition of "Pondage" which says what its function is. But those don't inform how it's calculated. So we do the calculation first. We end up with an amount. We end up doubling the amount that we compute. And then that volume is made available to the operator to use as they see fit, following the operating rules in the Treaty. I think is that in line with MR MINEAR: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm clear on your theory; I'm not endorsing your theory. But your theory doesn't need to consider a seven-day period for calculating pondage. It's calculating pondage according to a theory and a formula in the Treaty. MR MINEAR: Yes. MR MINEAR: And then there will be some operator who will decide how to utilise that pondage in actually operating 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 proceedings. The sort of qualitative side to it is something we could talk about; the details we could talk about. But are you able to speak to the Court a little bit about the differences that have now arisen that brings Pakistan to where it is today with its methodology? MR RAE: Over this methodology. I would observe that my involvement with Baglihar did not include the details of their pondage calculation. So I was involved peripherally to it, and predominantly involved in the spillway sediment intakes and the like. But the one thing that has been common to the Pakistan position is that the plant is to discharge at firm power, and that's a very important commonality between that time and now. And when they went through the Baglihar process, what you see presented certainly in the determination and to some degree the documents submitted by Pakistan after the first memorial were in some ways in response to questions that the Neutral Expert was bringing up through the process. And the process tended to take a life of its own and say, "Well, they want us to answer that question, so let's build it that way".

17:28 1	for firm power; and the other premise of the Pakistan	17:31 1	very clear that it is a certain amount, it's a megawatt
2	approach is that we have firm power and we have pondage	2	rate, as opposed to being a volume of water. And if it
3	in order to deal with the variability of the flow rate.	3	had been expressed as "minimum mean discharge" here, we
4	But it then got into a process of trying to determine	4	may have been discussing whether we meant minimum mean
5	the number of hours per day of generation, and that	5	discharge over five days or seven days or whatever. And
6	really wasn't part of the pondage calculation itself.	6	"power" to me adds more precision to the presentation
7	So I don't know if I'm helping with any of that	7	than I would have seen if perhaps it was in the rate of
8	answer.	8	minimum mean discharge.
9	THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is helpful. I have one or two other	9	THE CHAIRMAN: That is helpful. And again, feel free to
10	questions, unless you have any further observations.	10	push off this question. But when I look at Annexure E,
11	MR RAE: No, go ahead.	11	which wasn't part of your presentation, I do see there
12	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And feel free to push these questions	12	definitions, in Annexure E, paragraph 2. And there is
13	off to Dr Miles tomorrow if you wish to do so.	13	a definition at paragraph 2(h) on "Power Storage
14	MR RAE: If he starts throwing things at me, I'll know!	14	Capacity"
15	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let's hope it doesn't come to that!	15	MR RAE: Yes.
16	You took us in your presentation to Annexure D,	16	THE CHAIRMAN: which then essentially points to a volume
17	paragraph 2(i), and walked us through the language that	17	of water. And I wonder if there's any implications one
18	appears there as to the term "Firm Power".	18	should take from that comparison between Annexures D and
19	In my exchange with you, I noted that if one was	19	E in that respect.
20	trying to work their way to a pondage calculation, it	20	MR RAE: Again well, from an engineering standpoint,
21	seems like there's a lot easier way that we might be	21	they're quite different things and the calculations are
22	able to do this of the kind that I mentioned, where you	22	done differently. What Annexure E is allowing is the
23	just take the MMD, you bring those metric-cubed seconds	23	storage of water seasonally; and what they're defining
24	up to minutes, up to hours, you multiply the MMD by the	24	in here is a power pool which can be drawn from, as you
25	six hours that I think is your approach, and then we get	25	go through the seasons, to supplement the natural flow
	D 117		D 110
	Page 117		Page 119
17:29 1	a number that we're going to double to get maximum	17:33 1	of river, and that's what they call the "Power Storage".
17:29 1 2	a number that we're going to double to get maximum pondage.	17:33 1 2	of river, and that's what they call the "Power Storage". So they draw from that over a period of months. And the
2	pondage.	2	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the
2 3	pondage. MR RAE: Yes.	2 3	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use
2 3 4	pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one	2 3 4	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of
2 3 4 5	pondage.MR RAE: Yes.THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition	2 3 4 5	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station.
2 3 4 5 6	pondage.MR RAE: Yes.THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple	2 3 4 5 6	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D
2 3 4 5 6 7	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet 	2 3 4 5 6 7	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just written as "minimum mean discharge". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to "firm power", that is as was, I think, mentioned last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just written as "minimum mean discharge". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to "firm power", that is as was, I think, mentioned last week in your mind, that's referring to "firm power"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just written as "minimum mean discharge". And I think there was an observation that at one time, rather than to referring to this, it referred 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} $	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to "firm power", that is as was, I think, mentioned last week in your mind, that's referring to "firm Power" in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just written as "minimum mean discharge". And I think there was an observation that at one time, rather than to referring to this, it referred to a power factor, which is another concept altogether. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to "firm power", that is as was, I think, mentioned last week in your mind, that's referring to "firm Power" in the way it's being defined in Annexure D?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just written as "minimum mean discharge". And I think there was an observation that at one time, rather than to referring to this, it referred to a power factor, which is another concept altogether. 	$ \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 they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to "firm power", that is as was, I think, mentioned last week in your mind, that's referring to "firm power" in the way it's being defined in Annexure D? MR RAE: Yes, in its normal sense. And that's the point
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just written as "minimum mean discharge". And I think there was an observation that at one time, rather than to referring to this, it referred to a power factor, which is another concept altogether. But it also is just showing that there was an evolution in the terminology, and at the point they finally 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to "firm power", that is as was, I think, mentioned last week in your mind, that's referring to "firm power" in its normal sense, as opposed to "Firm Power" in the way it's being defined in Annexure D? MR RAE: Yes, in its normal sense. And that's the point where the reservoir is empty, for example, and it's at
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just written as "minimum mean discharge". And I think there was an observation that at one time, rather than to referring to this, it referred to a power factor, which is another concept altogether. But it also is just showing that there was an evolution in the terminology, and at the point they finally settled, they happened to settle on "Firm Power". 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to "firm power", that is as was, I think, mentioned last week in your mind, that's referring to "firm power" in its normal sense, as opposed to "Firm Power" in the way it's being defined in Annexure D? MR RAE: Yes, in its normal sense. And that's the point where the reservoir is empty, for example, and it's at its lowest level. Because when you drain a storage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just written as "minimum mean discharge". And I think there was an observation that at one time, rather than to referring to this, it referred to a power factor, which is another concept altogether. But it also is just showing that there was an evolution in the terminology, and at the point they finally 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to "firm power", that is as was, I think, mentioned last week in your mind, that's referring to "firm power" in its normal sense, as opposed to "Firm Power" in the way it's being defined in Annexure D? MR RAE: Yes, in its normal sense. And that's the point where the reservoir is empty, for example, and it's at
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 pondage. MR RAE: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the correct process by which one might determine pondage, it feels like that definition in paragraph 2(i) could have been made more simple we might not even use the term "Firm Power" and yet that's not what the Treaty drafters did. So I'm wondering if you have reflections on that. MR RAE: Well, now you're asking for conjecture, which is always dangerous to get into. But my own sense of it is that this is a document put together which evolved over time. And having started with the concept of power, they retained that in the definitions, even though the actual extension to the use of that in the pondage got supplanted by another procedure that, as you point out, could have been just written as "minimum mean discharge". And I think there was an observation that at one time, rather than to referring to this, it referred to a power factor, which is another concept altogether. But it also is just showing that there was an evolution in the terminology, and at the point they finally settled, they happened to settle on "Firm Power". 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 So they draw from that over a period of months. And the rate that they can withdraw from that constrains the use of the storage, but the rate is basically capacity of the power station. So that has no direct connection back to Annexure D because the computation and the purpose of the plant is very different. Annexure E does refer to a "firm power"; but again, it has the same meaning as the power at the minimum. But it's calculated completely differently, and it depends on the volume of the reservoir and the operating policies for how that reservoir is used, which are things that are not before us at this moment to present. THE CHAIRMAN: So that definition, if we can call it a definition it's not really a definition but that part of Annexure E at paragraph 21(a) which refers to "firm power", that is as was, I think, mentioned last week in your mind, that's referring to "firm power" in its normal sense, as opposed to "Firm Power" in the way it's being defined in Annexure D? MR RAE: Yes, in its normal sense. And that's the point where the reservoir is empty, for example, and it's at its lowest level. Because when you drain a storage

17:34 1	elevation. And it's the power available at the bottom,	17:37 1	Annexure E, is a seasonal variation; whereas under
2	when you have only the natural flow rate available	2	Annexure D, it's a daily thing. We don't know which
3	because you've drawn all your storage out, and that's	3	day, but it's sometime within the dry season; or the
4	the firm power there.	4	storage one tends to be, as a result of a long sequence
5	But you don't know how it can be calculated. It's	5	of low flows.
6	not related to something as simple as the minimum mean	6	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.
7	discharge that we're able to use in Annexure D.	7	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you, Mr Rae. Just quickly
8	An Annexure D calculation is simplifying the	8	following up on that.
9	calculation. The Annexure E calculation requires	9	Assuming that the "firm power" in Annexure E is the
10	operating policy and operating rules for the reservoir	10	normal meaning, not given special meaning by the Treaty
10	which derive these items.	10	because it's not capitalised, if you would apply, as
12	THE CHAIRMAN: Would it be accurate, or semi-accurate, to	12	an engineer, that calculation of firm power, would you
13	say that the way firm power is being approached in	13	use the load curve or any information about the loading
10	Annexure E perhaps is similar to what India's position	14	of the plant while doing so?
15	is with respect to Annexure D; that is, it's focusing on	15	MR RAE: No. No. The only use of the load curve that's
16	the plant more than it is on the MMD?	16	been made is to look at the daily timing of the peaks.
17	MR RAE: No. No. There's no relationship with the India	17	And it's an observation that in the India calculation,
18	calculation and Annexure E.	18	and also in the calculation that we make, there is no
10	The calculation that they make is the key	19	parameter that we take from the load curve and enter it
20	differences from what we're discussing here is they're	20	into some equations to come up with the calculation.
21	calculating with the installed capacity rather than firm	21	The only use that's being made of it is to look at the
22	power. We say there's no foundation for that in the	22	shape of the load curve and say: well, I need peaking
23	Treaty, but that's the first key difference. And the	23	within these hours of the day.
24	other key difference is they're taking the firm power	24	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Yes, if you use the shape, then clearly
25	equivalent to a volume of energy. And again, we're	25	you use information related to the loading, isn't it?
	Page 121		Page 123
15.04 1		17.20 1	
17:36 1	saying that's not consistent with the definitions such	17:39 1	
2	as you see on the screen here.	2	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're
2 3	as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at	2 3	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of
2 3 4	as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation.	2 3 4	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are
2 3 4 5	as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on	2 3 4 5	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the
2 3 4 5 6	as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for	2 3 4 5 6	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're
2 3 4 5 6 7	as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant?	2 3 4 5 6 7	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	as you see on the screen here.What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation.THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant?MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will have no storage in the Indus of that volume. But as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at a baseload in the northern region which is over
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will have no storage in the Indus of that volume. But as that water level of the lake drops, the power capacity 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at a baseload in the northern region which is over 100,000 MW. And for the all-India case, it's
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will have no storage in the Indus of that volume. But as that water level of the lake drops, the power capacity of the plant drops as well. And at some point it gets 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at a baseload in the northern region which is over 100,000 MW. And for the all-India case, it's whatever the number is. Off the top of my head, it's
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will have no storage in the Indus of that volume. But as that water level of the lake drops, the power capacity of the plant drops as well. And at some point it gets to its minimum storage level, where it can't generate 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at a baseload in the northern region which is over 100,000 MW. And for the all-India case, it's whatever the number is. Off the top of my head, it's 300,000 or 400,000 or something. And we're now talking
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will have no storage in the Indus of that volume. But as that water level of the lake drops, the power capacity of the plant drops as well. And at some point it gets to its minimum storage level, where it can't generate any more, and its firm power is at that level. That's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at a baseload in the northern region which is over 100,000 MW. And for the all-India case, it's whatever the number is. Off the top of my head, it's 300,000 or 400,000 or something. And we're now talking about power stations of 500-1,000 MW. The amount that
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will have no storage in the Indus of that volume. But as that water level of the lake drops, the power capacity of the plant drops as well. And at some point it gets to its minimum storage level, where it can't generate any more, and its firm power is at that level. That's because as the water level drops down, it's reducing the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at a baseload in the northern region which is over 100,000 MW. And for the all-India case, it's whatever the number is. Off the top of my head, it's 300,000 or 400,000 or something. And we're now talking about power stations of 500-1,000 MW. The amount that those vary during the day has next to no significance to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will have no storage in the Indus of that volume. But as that water level of the lake drops, the power capacity of the plant drops as well. And at some point it gets to its minimum storage level, where it can't generate any more, and its firm power is at that level. That's because as the water level drops down, it's reducing the head parameter in the equation here. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT : You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE : Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at a baseload in the northern region which is over 100,000 MW. And for the all-India case, it's whatever the number is. Off the top of my head, it's 300,000 or 400,000 or something. And we're now talking about power stations of 500-1,000 MW. The amount that those vary during the day has next to no significance to that load curve, and it's within the precision of that
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will have no storage in the Indus of that volume. But as that water level of the lake drops, the power capacity of the plant drops as well. And at some point it gets to its minimum storage level, where it can't generate any more, and its firm power is at that level. That's because as the water level drops down, it's reducing the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE: Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at a baseload in the northern region which is over 100,000 MW. And for the all-India case, it's whatever the number is. Off the top of my head, it's 300,000 or 400,000 or something. And we're now talking about power stations of 500-1,000 MW. The amount that those vary during the day has next to no significance to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 as you see on the screen here. What's going on in Annexure E has no relationship at all to how they make that computation. THE CHAIRMAN: You're not focused, in Annexure E, on installed capacity of the plant as the basis for identifying the firm power of the plant? MR RAE: Annexure E would not use the installed capacity either. The installed capacity will not be an outcome of that firm power. I would have to look at the specific wording. But it would be an extremely unusual situation in the industry to have a firm power equal to installed capacity for a large storage project. THE CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? MR RAE: And when I refer to a storage project, think of Lake Mead. You have a situation where Lake Mead, the level drops over a period of years. Now, India will have no storage in the Indus of that volume. But as that water level of the lake drops, the power capacity of the plant drops as well. And at some point it gets to its minimum storage level, where it can't generate any more, and its firm power is at that level. That's because as the water level drops down, it's reducing the head parameter in the equation here. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I said about the Indian power system last week, we're looking at a power system in the northern region of 100,000 MW, and we're looking at plants here that are less than 1% of that. So when you start looking at the significance of those plants in their peaking, they're almost insignificant compared to the total load available. So that load curve actually has almost no influence at all on any of the pondage calculations. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT : You referred now to the cumulative load curve. But you can also think about the daily variation in loading, which obviously gives you information about when the peaking happens and when an operator needs to contribute to the peak. MR RAE : Yes, I'm referring to the daily ones which I displayed to you. I showed four for the year, typical seasons. And in each of those, you're looking at a baseload in the northern region which is over 100,000 MW. And for the all-India case, it's whatever the number is. Off the top of my head, it's 300,000 or 400,000 or something. And we're now talking about power stations of 500-1,000 MW. The amount that those vary during the day has next to no significance to that load curve, and it's within the precision of that

Day 0 11	caring on the ments, i list i hase	-		Wohday; 15 July 202
17 40 1		17.44	1	
17:40 1		17:44		a variability of a much greater storage that's being
2	MR RAE: It's a round-off error in the		2	utilised.
3	THE CHAIRMAN: Just if I can be sure I understand what you inst asid to Depfersor Durtoart		3	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much for your presentation. We've kept you a good 15 minutes past the
4	just said to Professor Buytaert.		4	
5	The load curve is, generally speaking, not so relevant in Annexure D. But it was a little less clear		5	normal time, but that is clearly because we are quite
6			6 7	interested in what you had to say.
7	to me: are you saying it's also not relevant with		7 °	MR RAE: Okay.
8	respect to a storage work being used for hydroelectric		8	THE CHAIRMAN: So thank you, Mr Rae, very much.
9	power in Annexure E?		9	Sir Daniel, we did not get to Dr Morris today.
10	1		10	I take it he might be first up tomorrow, and then we
11	(slide 11). This is referring to the section on		11 12	would proceed with the scheme that you presented to us
12	run-of-river projects with pondage in the text, but it's			this morning. Is that correct?
13	dependent on the minimum stream flow. And they refer in this text to the "connected load curve". And the most		13	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, I think that that's right. It's
14			14	certainly right that we'll have Dr Morris first up. If
15	important influence of connected load curve here was to		15	you are happy to do so, I think that we'd like to
16	make sure that a given power station, when you're adding		16	reflect on the order and timing of the proceedings, and
17	it to the power system, had enough capacity or,		17	maybe make a little bit of an adjustment in terms of
18	sorry, that there was enough demand to be able to use		18	that. If you want us to come back, as it were, formally
19 20	the capacity. And that check against the load to make		19 20	to request the latitude to do so, we're happy to do so.
20	sure you can actually use it enters into the economic		20 21	But if you are happy for me to go back into my MC role
21 22	analysis. And I'm sure Dr Blackmore will remember back to the		21 22	tomorrow morning and just indicate how we'll proceed,
22	World Commission on Dams. There was an interesting		22 23	and the sequence and timing, that would be also helpful. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I don't think there's any need to come
23 24	section presented where they looked at the economic		23 24	back to us with a request, but I think it would be
24	viability of a lot of these projects and found that		24 25	useful to receive something that indicates basically
25	viability of a for of these projects and round that		25	userul to receive something that indicates basically
	Page 125			Page 127
17:42 1	there simply wasn't demand when the projects entered,	17:45		what the line-up will be for tomorrow, so that we can
2	and they spent years as under-utilised resources. And		2	see it in front of us and benefit from that.
3	that's the process that's being talked about here. And		3	SIR DANIEL: We will certainly do that before we come and
4 5	that's the importance of load curve here, which was probably more relevant 50 years ago than it is today.		4	stand up. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you.
6	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm still wondering then, in		5 6	In that case, I think we are done for the day. Many
0 7	Annexure E, when you're calculating maximum pondage and		7	thanks for the presentations. They were extremely
8	it says, "it shall not exceed the Pondage required for		8	helpful, and I think showed a lot of hard work over the
9	the firm power of the plant", what is the central		9	weekend, so it's much appreciated. I hope you have some
10	variable that one is grabbing a hold of in that context?		10	respite this evening. But no doubt tomorrow we will
11			11	benefit greatly from whatever further work you do.
12	that's pondage within the overall storage.		12	Thank you very much.
13	So you've stored, say, 20 metres' depth of water.		13	SIR DANIEL: Thank you.
14	And what the power system operator is allowed to do		14	(5.46 pm)
15	within the shorter period of time I believe it refers		15	(The hearing adjourned until 9.30 am the following day)
16	to a week is to have a certain amount of pondage		16	
17	within that overall volume that they have to operate		17	
18	within certain constraints. So they can't shut it down		18	
19	to zero; they have to maintain some flow rate. But they		19	
20	have the flexibility within that short period, as they		20	
21	release water from the greater storage, to have that		21	
22	fluctuate using the amount of pondage.		22	
23	And we're getting into a lot of detail here, but		23	
24	that's the purpose of pondage in that case. And again,		24	
25	it's quite different from Annexure D, because it's		25	
	Page 126			Page 128
	1 420 120			1 ugt 120

A	actually 30:17,20 31:7	121:25 126:24	analogy 72:19	90:18,23	15:12,14,17,25 16:8
	31:23 57:13 67:16	against 46:17 56:3	analyses 62:12 102:16	applause 42:22	16:21 17:10 18:1,3
ABDULLAH 2:13	74:23 92:8 96:22	125:19	107:8		19:1,17,19 20:19
ability 68:21 86:21				applicable 75:20	· · ·
able 36:25 37:15	113:9 114:24 124:8	Agent 2:4	analysis 17:22,24 47:9	application 22:13	21:17,19 24:9,24
38:11 39:14 41:5	125:20	aggregate 69:7 73:1	54:13 60:11 61:13	62:21 92:15 93:24	26:9,11,12,17,18,23
49:1 54:9 65:23	add 4:1 82:20 98:21	aggregation 92:5	61:19 62:7,13,21	98:3 99:16	27:16 28:6,14 29:12
80:23 81:1 82:16	added 60:19 70:12,16	ago 38:23 54:4 90:5	64:10 81:19 84:19	applied 62:25	31:5 32:6 33:5
97:16 110:15 112:2	70:18,25 102:15	102:17 126:5	86:8,8,16,20 87:1	applies 73:19 99:9	37:17 40:8 52:1
	adding 125:16	agree 17:21 27:17	88:15 90:1 92:22,24	109:13	54:3
112:14 114:4,5	additional 4:1 39:9	57:20 113:4	96:5,13,15,18 97:4	apply 12:20 81:20	ASAD 2:6
115:13 116:5	additive 110:25	agreement 22:16 36:3	97:11,19 100:11	108:9 123:11	ascertain 18:20
117:22 121:7	address 3:23 4:14,21	36:4	103:13,14 104:19	applying 7:14 47:25	ascertaining 10:23
125:18				11, 0	
abnormal 107:15	6:1,4,13,20 7:8,10	agrees 46:2	106:15 109:18	appointment 22:19	asked 8:17 9:3,17 27:5
abnormally 88:22	7:12 8:5,8,14 15:16	ahead 21:13 42:21	110:9,24 112:15,15	appraisal 61:4	30:4 40:3 41:15
96:6 97:7,8	41:5 45:23 47:21,23	117:11	125:21	appreciate 109:11	49:7 52:24 67:12
about 4:22 5:6 6:10,17	49:1 50:25 51:12	AKBAR 2:4	analytical 89:7 90:23	appreciated 57:25	90:25
6:23 8:1,11 21:16	53:10 54:1 56:1	Ali 2:5 7:15	106:14 110:6	128:9	asking 53:16 57:19
	57:8,23 110:16	alia 10:16 52:5	analytically 105:13	appreciation 42:23	71:23 118:10
27:14 32:16 34:6,17	addressed 3:19,25 7:5	allocate 82:1	animating 11:13	approach 10:11 23:8	asks 18:24 25:2
46:21 48:19,22	8:22 9:8,21 14:5	allow 26:13 31:13	Annexure 1:1 7:11	28:11 29:4 32:6	aspect 6:5 34:17 79:12
53:13,17 55:9 56:25	-				-
66:17 86:13 92:1	19:23 22:23 23:17	38:5 40:25	13:15,17,21,21,24	43:14 44:1 45:10,11	aspects 5:14 57:12
94:21 113:6,25	23:19 24:3 26:8	allowable 58:22	14:4,6 16:24 21:20	54:22 78:1,21 85:2	assess 52:25
114:1 116:3,4,6	27:1 34:22 35:9,14	allowed 126:14	22:18 25:22 26:6	87:19,20 88:14,20	assessment 12:23 62:8
123:13 124:2,11,12	42:5,10,14 43:2,11	allowing 86:2 119:22	48:14 49:2 50:14	96:23,25 100:18	assign 100:15
124:22 126:3	46:8,15,23 47:12	allows 22:2 109:14	51:21 52:2,6,12,12	103:6,11 105:13	assigned 104:1
above 38:3 66:4.8	48:14 50:10,21	all-India 124:19	55:5 63:3,14 64:9	109:22 117:2,25	Assistant 2:21
85:24 99:2	addresses 10:13 14:6	almost 34:15 47:3	69:4,5 73:5 83:16	approached 54:10	associated 5:19 96:15
absolute 54:15 60:24	44:25 57:12	124:7,8	85:9 88:13 93:8	121:13	assume 7:15 54:2 92:5
	addressing 4:7,23	alone 12:25 93:25	114:3 117:16	approaches 87:11	assumed 92:7 95:3
72:16	5:13 7:3 37:5 48:15	99:3	119:10,12,22 120:6	92:12,16 116:1	101:23
absolutely 51:18	49:6 53:14	along 28:25 29:1,2,2	120:8,17,21 121:7,8	approaching 34:15	assumes 93:1
54:11,20,21 57:18	adds 97:18 119:6	33:17 38:1,4	121:9,14,15,18	78:6	assuming 5:9 55:18
67:7,10	adhere 102:5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		appropriate 4:2 29:9	
absorb 70:24		alongside 12:8	122:3,5,8 123:1,2,9		87:2 109:23 123:9
acceleration 73:22	adjourned 128:15	already 1:9 4:16 25:7	125:6,9 126:7,11,25	44:15 45:8,24 47:9	assumption 76:3
78:9 79:17	adjust 43:22	26:8 33:14 37:4	annexures 13:12,13	58:25 81:1,23	88:24 95:5 98:7
accept 20:14 21:12	adjusting 67:21	42:10 46:14 83:25	13:14 119:18	approvals 21:2,2	100:9,12
29:21	adjustment 97:23	91:6	annoying 64:25	April 19:23	assumptions 87:4,7
acceptable 44:14	127:17	alternative 31:10,11	annual 60:4,15 64:22	arbitration 1:1,4 2:19	92:10 93:18 105:22
accepted 111:18	adjustments 22:7	31:12 69:22 70:1	another 27:9 71:12	6:3 53:15	107:1 108:8
access 22:21 66:21	43:21	82:6 87:6 92:12	72:19 97:18 103:10	area 103:21 104:12,21	assured 84:8 87:21
accordance 38:19	adopt 103:14	100:22 106:25	118:16,21	105:3	attempt 87:10
40:19	adopted 23:8	alternatives 24:19	answer 1:22 18:23	Argentina 23:17	attention 28:17 37:18
according 63:10 64:5	advance 9:20 14:1	31:1,8 71:15 87:5	30:19 34:3 61:11	arguing 28:6 76:24	ATTILA 2:12
	15:6 17:3,22 22:18	93:12,21 102:11	64:21 67:11 91:23	argument 25:20 51:14	Attorney 2:7
85:8 100:20 101:25	25:20 26:5,14	106:20	92:1 116:23 117:8	arguments 50:17	attributed 42:23
110:3 114:20	advanced 21:16	although 16:8 40:5	answered 3:18 67:2	57:15	August 35:3 39:3,17
accordingly 107:24	advantage 104:15	66:18 79:14 84:14	anticipate 5:24 6:10	arise 21:25 59:3 72:24	authority 37:23 97:15
account 19:13 44:14	105:5 111:15 112:8	84:18 103:12	51:1	84:25	automatic 38:13
81:12 88:18 110:15	112:10	altogether 118:21	anticipates 6:17 17:15		available 2:24 12:3
accrue 23:2	Advisor 2:6,14,15	always 62:19 92:20	anxious 8:1	arises 69:15	15:23 16:5 24:3
accumulate 90:13	Advisor 2:6,14,15 Affairs 2:6	aiways 62:19 92:20 118:11		arising 6:7 52:4 93:24	
accumulated 99:23			anyone 65:23	8	33:7,13,20 37:16
accumulates 101:16	affect 12:1 19:6 93:17	AL-KHASAWNEH	anything 55:9 57:14	101:3	52:14 61:17,25 62:3
accumulation 89:24	afford 14:15	1:10	anyway 115:9	around 6:10 79:11	63:8 64:23,24 65:1
accurate 121:12	after 7:2 21:7 38:15	Ambassador 2:7	anywhere 80:22 99:21	97:2	65:2,7,8,9,14 66:6
achieve 85:23	38:18 48:6 49:22	amongst 10:21	107:23	arrange 40:7	66:10,11,15,23
achieved 16:21	91:22,24 108:5	amount 4:19 65:2	apart 47:12	arrangement 74:8	67:14,16,18,22 68:7
across 5:17 6:6 13:13	116:20	66:9 72:16,21 73:1	apologise 60:22	arrangements 10:20	68:10 70:9,24 74:7
39:1 52:22 61:3	afternoon 2:11 4:22	76:18 79:4 82:20	apparent 42:17 43:5	18:18 40:16	77:16 84:8 85:25
65:21 89:18 104:13	5:12,22 6:22 7:23	84:13 85:2,7 86:15	53:11	arrive 96:14	86:14,22 87:22,24
act 12:13	again 6:13,18 9:7	95:19 96:20 101:5	appear 59:1	arrived 19:12,15	88:4,17 89:8,9,10
	22:22 28:13 39:11	102:1 103:17 104:4	APPEARANCES 2:1	arrives 19:11,14 76:17	89:18 90:10 91:7,12
acted 27:6 34:19	50:14 55:2,3 64:22	104:6,23 112:22	appears 43:20 70:21	arriving 2:10	100:16 104:4,9,13
acting 72:12	65:15 80:1 81:17	114:12,12 115:4,5	72:24 117:18	arrow 61:23	104:14 105:12
active 86:24	82:5,18 83:17 84:12	115:25 119:1	appended 68:8	article 1:1 8:19 10:4,8	106:21 108:24
actual 68:1 69:15 86:4	86:8 87:2 94:4 98:9	124:22 126:16,22	appendix 13:19 14:4,6	10:10,12,12,13,18	110:13 114:13
90:7 94:7 95:22		amounts 71:17	••		
100:13 101:22	101:19 102:18		16:24 17:6,12 18:6	11:7,9,15,20 12:8	121:1,2 124:8
102:9 103:1 105:25	103:2 110:25 119:9	analogous 72:17,19	18:8,14 65:25 69:4	12:10,17,19 13:1,6	average 81:11 83:2
106:3 118:15	119:20 120:9	analogously 72:22	69:5 80:3 89:6	13:6,7 14:22 15:7	94:25 96:9,21 98:8
	<u> </u>				<u> </u>

-					-
98:21 99:13,17	31:7 38:25 39:13	6:25 7:24 8:11	111:2 123:6,7,24	case 1:3 2:22 2:15	check 125:19
100:19 107:8	71:24 91:5 102:21	16:23 27:22 30:16	124:10 125:1,4	3:21 7:18 23:16	Chenab 29:2 115:9
averaged 72:2	110:11 122:6	31:15 32:13,25 38:2		24:2 27:13 28:20	choice 15:13 25:18
averaging 92:25	baton 5:8	48:19 49:25 60:22	С	46:22 47:20 50:8	choose 36:9
avoid 21:22 43:8	bear 64:25	61:7 64:25 65:15	cadence 52:18,18	55:14 60:18 76:19	choosing 25:14
45:20	bearing 33:22	77:23 79:11 104:25	calculate 38:11 90:4	84:16 87:15 101:21	chosen 83:24
award 4:15,23 24:3,5	became 38:15 97:7	116:5 125:10	94:24 95:1 96:25	107:21 122:25	circulate 21:1
27:7,7 35:10,11,14	102:15	127:17	115:4	124:19 126:24	circumstances 25:19
35:25 36:12,14	become 8:11 71:10	black 15:20	calculated 71:25	128:6	circumvent 17:25
38:20 39:22 40:12	101:8	Blackmore 1:11 61:11	75:23 80:17 88:7	cases 3:18 4:16,18	43:8
40:19 45:25 46:2,8	becomes 30:1 33:20	66:25 67:2,9,15	108:22 110:2	93:1	clarification 27:2
46:13,13,20,22 47:3	95:24 97:17 105:11	125:22	114:10 120:10	cast 15:10	35:12 72:3
50:2 53:7,24 54:3,9	before 1:9 1:8,15 2:22	blank 87:16	121:5	categories 8:20 14:6	clarify 85:20
55:11,21,23 56:3,10	3:1 14:8 18:3 20:1	blessed 32:23	calculating 77:5 78:1	14:10,23 19:2 30:22	clarity 5:3 73:4 77:10
56:11 57:3,6,6,7,11	27:18 28:8 29:16	BLINK 2:22	79:16,19 81:2	93:22	78:25
57:20	46:19 57:13 58:20	blue 95:14 100:9	113:22 114:20,20	category 17:11 19:9	clean 41:20
awards 6:3 34:20 35:6	59:1 67:12 102:20	104:12 108:20	121:21 126:7	cater 43:23	clear 12:18,23 16:10
53:3	103:6 120:13 128:3	110:12	calculation 38:5,10	caught 46:10	16:18 18:7 35:23
aware 11:10	begin 53:7	both 3:4 22:8 45:1	54:23 55:3,5 59:15	cause 11:24 12:7	36:6 44:21 48:5
away 77:17 113:3	beginning 9:20 14:2,9	46:17 50:12,23 51:6	65:4 76:16 78:7,15	16:12,12 56:4	51:15,18 63:20,22
AWN 1:10	15:6 17:4 26:5,15	68:21 75:22 84:19	79:10 80:11,25	caused 97:6	77:3 112:5 114:17
awry 3:4	28:24 96:2,3,10	91:5 103:24 104:15	81:15,20 82:10	causes 12:15	119:1 125:6
axis 95:13 103:17,18	begins 7:24 10:10	105:5 108:3 115:23	85:12,22 88:11,12	central 126:9	clearer 3:10 67:3
103:19	behalf 3:1 2:20	bother 41:2	89:3,5 90:2,21 95:5	certain 52:18 68:7,22	71:10
A(1) 36:13 38:20	being 13:19 22:4 28:8	bothersome 45:4	96:1 106:18 108:5	82:20 103:16 104:4	clearest 36:1
n	30:16 32:17 48:5	bottom 54:17 61:3,20	108:23 113:10,17	104:6 115:5 119:1	clearly 40:24 53:19
<u> </u>	68:11 69:20 70:4	104:3,3,13 121:1	114:11 116:11	126:16,18	80:17 85:6 123:24
b 12:14 13:19 35:10	72:9 74:6 76:10	bound 23:10 57:5 97:3	117:6,20 121:8,9,9	certainly 33:18 47:3	127:5
47:22	78:20 81:13,23	104:12	121:18,19 123:12	52:22 106:21	clever 67:11
back 4:9 8:14 11:6	84:25 92:6,13,14	bounded 68:9	123:17,18,20	110:23 116:18	clock 26:7
13:3 16:22 28:22	93:2 97:12 103:6	bounds 102:15	calculations 78:8,13	127:14 128:3	close 7:17 42:21 47:20
31:23 33:4 34:9	106:7 108:6,8,22	box 67:5	79:21 90:18 95:20	cetera 73:25 78:10	49:22 61:2
41:20 47:19 55:2	112:21 119:2 120:21 121:13	braces 23:6 brave 56:20,21	97:25 119:21 124:9	Chairman 1:3,17 2:4	closed 3:13
58:3,14 59:25 64:21	123:21 125:8 126:3	breach 25:15 34:14	calibrated 55:4	2:13,17 3:12 4:22 5:5 7:13,22 8:3	closely 38:9 49:25 closer 104:10
74:25 81:21,22 84:2	125.21 125.8 120.5	36:3 40:11	call 5:18 11:15 120:1	19:21 23:4 25:6	closing 2:12 4:9 7:3,12
108:17 110:20	believe 37:7,9 79:23	break 3:1 7:2 48:2,3,7	120:15	26:24 27:4,8,20	47:21 48:16 49:3
111:1,4 120:6 124:1	85:10 98:2 126:15	48:11 55:17 58:2,7	called 83:25 108:21	28:4,10 30:4,19	coffee 3:1 58:2,7
125:22 127:18,20	below 36:7 66:16	58:12	CAMERON 2:11	32:4,9,17 33:22	colleagues 3:22 48:9
127:24	67:14 68:4 86:1	brief 4:4,6,6,18 7:18	cancel 78:14,16	34:1,10,11,13 41:3	108:12
background 62:16	94:11 100:3 115:8	42:13 45:22 91:16	cancelling 78:19	42:20 43:1 44:25	collected 38:23
back-and-forth 49:14	belt 23:5	briefer 24:25	capabilities 60:16	45:21,23 46:24	collection 92:22
Baglihar 44:5,8,22	benefit 47:15,16 61:5	briefly 3:9 41:5	62:8	47:18,24 48:2,7,12	collects 38:21
53:2 54:10,14 55:12	61:19 128:2,11	brighter 21:9	capability 70:12,15,19	48:17,23 49:9,13,18	colour 66:6
56:12 87:14 88:15	benefits 61:14,15	bring 117:23	70:20 104:9	50:1,6 51:9 52:22	colour-blind 66:4
92:23 93:5 99:17	112:23	bringing 75:25 83:8	capacity 55:6 61:5,6,9	53:18 55:16,24	columns 65:22
115:24 116:9,17 balance 36:17 99:5,7	bespoke 71:9 75:20	116:21	61:12,14,15,19,21 63:10,13 64:3,11	57:24 58:8,14,19	combination 100:2
99:19 100:17	best 3:3 49:13 91:22	brings 24:6 26:2 27:4	66:5,9 68:16,20,24	66:25 67:11 74:21	103:7 105:1 106:22
102:14,22	91:24 92:21 104:8	34:18 41:7 83:20	68:25 69:1,2,3,7,12	77:9,22 78:5,18	combine 74:14 93:25
balanced 98:20	Bethlehem 2:10 3:3	108:10 116:6	69:16,20,21 70:4,6	79:13,25 81:4 83:12	98:12
balances 61:13 99:7	better 28:15	broad 64:4	70:8,10,14 75:1,2,7	88:6 91:13 108:11	combining 109:13
bandwidth 49:1	between 1:15 5:11,20	broader 18:17	75:8,11 88:10 93:3	111:3 115:23 117:9	come 2:6 3:8 4:5,8
Bank's 56:16	10:21 16:10,18	brought 29:9 52:9	93:7 107:23 119:14	117:12,15 118:4	6:23 8:14 11:6 13:3
bar 104:3 108:20	21:22 22:25 23:17	BRYCE 2:21	120:4 121:21 122:6	119:9,16 120:15	14:18 16:22 24:25
110:12	26:10 28:16 31:18	build 45:5,5,5 116:24	122:8,9,13,19	121:12 122:5,14	28:25 31:9 32:3
bare 24:21	46:7 53:15 58:23	building 6:21	125:17,19	123:6 125:3 126:6	34:9 41:20 45:21
based 38:10 59:14	60:5 61:21,23 68:15	Buildings 2:11,12	capitalised 123:11	127:3,8,13,23 128:5	48:13 49:18 55:2
64:10 88:15 105:13	86:25 96:20 97:24	built 7:23	capped 82:8 101:9	Chair's 80:1	56:2,3 57:17 58:3
113:11	100:24 109:25	burdens 1:18	capture 62:5 65:18	challenge 51:13 52:9	59:25 79:9,9,22
baseload 105:12	112:19 116:1,16	burdensome 45:4	94:15	challenges 7:4	81:2,22 82:5 101:21
124:18	119:18	BURKI 2:6	car 82:24	chance 21:9	103:10 110:22
bases 106:17	beyond 20:21 22:10	business 73:25	care 46:21	change 12:15	111:1,11 117:15
basic 87:20 111:19	29:18 31:19 45:7	Buytaert 1:12 74:22	careful 75:21	changed 55:14	123:20 127:18,23
basically 32:5 78:22	51:19 56:12,12,23	74:23 75:10 76:2,19	carried 107:21	changes 70:18 107:15	128:3
111:18,24 120:4	bifurcated 46:4,12	77:8 81:4,5 82:4,13	carry 110:11,14	changing 89:13	comes 25:9,20 31:4
127:25	biggest 102:2	82:16 83:1,11	carrying 78:13	channel 10:15	33:4 43:20 45:3
Basin 45:9	binding 6:2	108:13,16,19,25	carry-forward 109:15	characteristic 115:20	48:4 51:17 52:11
basis 4:24 24:20 31:2	bit 3:8 4:17 5:7,17	109:2,9,23 110:10	car's 72:20	characteristics 105:14	57:8 73:3 79:19

	,	-			,
82:18 84:2 96:19	computations 71:13	considers 17:9 21:15	cooperatively 29:4	crystallised 26:20	43:1,2 48:8,11,15
comfort 63:19	96:14 105:19	24:10 46:18	core 54:15	31:6	48:21,24 49:17 50:6
coming 42:24 56:8	compute 90:6,12	consistent 23:22 62:23	corollary 25:13	crystallises 27:25	51:12 53:18 55:24
64:16 79:10 80:20	96:11 102:11	64:14 68:6 75:17	correct 2:1 28:9 54:18	29:17	57:24 58:5,10 127:9
93:19 97:21 102:20	114:13	122:1	67:7,10 76:4,12	crystallize 8:20 14:23	
			· · · ·	19:2	127:13 128:3,13
110:8	computed 66:21 74:11	constant 111:25	79:14 80:12,13		dashed 61:8
comity 47:12 50:22	84:19 85:7 96:5	constrain 115:8	97:16 100:20 108:3	cubed 74:18	data 10:5,6,17 12:2,19
53:14	99:12 102:23	constrained 115:17,18	118:4 127:12	cubic 76:18 81:16	14:11,12 15:22 16:3
commence 2:15 20:2	105:19 112:24	constrains 120:3	corrected 78:19	cumecs 36:15,16,20	18:11 33:6 38:21,22
commencement 22:20	computing 73:11	constraint 99:9	correction 2:3	39:2,16	38:25 39:14 40:3,5
comment 89:2	conceiving 30:16	constraints 9:4 14:25	corrections 97:13	cumulative 99:20,20	65:24 69:6 86:22
comments 3:10 4:4	concept 20:5 70:19	25:2 42:18 43:6,23	107:6	124:10	88:21 92:21 93:19
56:24 91:20	71:10 98:24 118:14	99:10 102:8 109:14	correctly 28:1,13	current 91:5	94:7,23 97:1,3,6,15
commission 10:14,14	118:21	126:18	62:25 67:15 75:1	cursor 60:23	98:4 101:22 102:9
10:19 11:2 13:7	conception 20:12,21	construct 11:23 12:21	77:25 111:20	curve 70:6,23 86:11	103:1,8 105:18
33:3 125:23	concepts 93:14,16	16:11 19:16,17	correspondence 39:24	94:2 97:1 99:21,22	106:4 107:16 110:3
commissioned 32:14	107:3	20:15 24:13 26:20	40:5 41:2	100:3,8 103:12,14	date 39:18
35:3	concern 41:9 112:7	29:13,17 30:3 31:6	corresponding 39:7	103:19,21,22,24	dated 39:25 40:6
Commissioner 2:5	concerned 113:10	31:14,23	69:5 76:21	104:2,12,17,22,24	dates 52:18,19
13:16 40:2 44:7,10	concerning 6:1 7:4,10	constructed 31:13	correspondingly	105:3,4,7,10,15	day 1:6 1:21,25 7:21
44:19	8:5 23:13 35:5	42:16 43:4	72:11	106:6 110:23	8:24,25 9:1,2,9,10
commissions 20:17	58:22 59:5	construction 9:20	cost 31:15	123:13,15,19,22	9:11,12,12,13,14,22
28:1 32:7	concerns 20:24 48:21	14:2,9 15:6 17:4	costs 23:2 61:13	124:8,11,24 125:5	21:14 34:22 41:24
commitments 25:13	111:14	20:1 22:21 23:20	costs/additional 23:2	125:14,15 126:4	41:25,25 42:1,2,3,4
45:15	conclude 2:25 26:24	26:5,15 27:18 29:16	Counsel 2:21,21	curves 101:20	56:9 65:9 70:10
common 71:3 116:13	concluded 36:4	32:23	counterfactual 69:25	cycle 87:2 92:4 107:9	72:2 81:12 83:3
commonality 116:15	concludes 47:18	consult 30:2	counterpart 39:24	cycles 91:20 92:9	87:23,25 88:3 89:9
communicate 14:3	concluding 7:18 56:24	contains 10:2,4 13:21	40:7.15		89:11,12 90:7,15,17
communication 10:15	conclusion 83:13	contemplated 28:8	country 42:15	D	90:21 91:2,4,6,9,10
13:22	conclusions 47:9	contemporaneous	countrywide 43:4	d 1:10 13:15,17,21,21	94:15 95:15,15,20
compared 111:6 124:7	55:15 87:14	106:12	couple 27:13 48:10		98:17 99:11,12,23
compares 99:20	condition 87:21,22	contemporary 23:11	62:17	13:24 14:6 16:24	105:24 107:15
comparison 68:18	96:1 105:8	content 15:11 18:5	course 2:6 7:21 24:2	21:20 22:18 25:22	108:24,25 109:6,7
119:18	conditions 68:1 85:23	25:23 55:10	34:7 39:16 47:20	26:6 40:8 51:21	113:20,21,21
compatible 22:9	conduct 50:23,24 51:6	context 23:18 30:14	56:14 69:11 77:2,4	52:6,12 55:5 63:3	115:13 117:5 123:3
competence 7:4 40:24	confidentiality 51:16	50:5 52:25 55:18	91:24 92:10 95:8	63:14 64:9 69:4	123:23 124:23
50:12,13 51:19 52:4	52:21	62:9 63:3 65:15	Court 1:4 2:19 3:4,5,9	73:5 83:16 85:9	128:6,15
52:9 53:4,10 56:1	confine 42:12	68:24 70:11 71:20	3:10,11 2:18 3:13	88:13 93:8 114:3	days 38:23 39:7 68:4
competent 51:11	conflict 85:11	78:12 126:10	5:5 6:2,6 7:22 8:3	117:16 119:18	81:9 82:21 86:13,14
complete 32:22	conflicts 21:22 84:4	contingency 7:23	19:21 23:4,15 25:6	120:6,21 121:7,8,15	91:11,19 94:15 95:4
completely 56:3	confluence 26:18	continue 58:4	26:25 27:1,4 34:5,7	123:2 125:6 126:25	96:6 99:18 100:1,6
103:10 120:10	confused 32:13	continues 73:14 76:14	36:12 41:3 44:25	dailies 67:25	112:12 119:5,5
		continuous 66:13		daily 12:15 64:22 68:2	· · · · · ·
completion 21:7 22:14	confusion 72:24 84:24		45:21,24 46:5,18,20	68:2 81:8,8 86:10	dead 36:7
22:20	conjecture 118:10	88:24	46:24,24 47:18	87:21 88:7,8,22	deal 4:13 30:1 35:16
complex 92:14 99:1	conjunction 20:8 42:6	continuously 88:17	48:22 51:5,6,10	90:6,10 91:5 92:17	35:17 51:2 64:18
complexity 98:22	connected 10:24 14:2	continuum 33:17 34:3	53:15,22,24 54:2	94:5,9 95:1,3 96:14	75:21 79:3,4,5
102:15 103:7 108:4	17:4 18:20 125:14	contractor 20:9 22:19	55:20 56:21 57:1,5	96:25 98:7,20 99:13	80:23,24 82:19
109:17,20	125:15	contrast 17:10	58:2,20 87:1 90:25	99:14 100:13,23	107:5 117:3
compliance 4:14	connection 6:9 11:4	contravention 35:25	108:15 116:5	101:22 102:3,6,14	dealing 79:1 82:18
25:21 27:6 34:19	23:20 48:18 120:6	contribute 70:21	Court's 1:22 5:1 27:6	102:21 103:1,12,13	109:20
35:6,8,12	conscious 56:16	71:21 124:14	34:20 35:6,8,14	106:23,24 107:5,13	deals 13:6 73:1
compliant 108:7	consciousness 6:15	control 37:14,22	Co-operation 11:9	109:3 110:10 111:9	dealt 62:6
complicated 104:25	consequence 54:21	38:12,18 39:2 45:19	Creager 69:16,18 71:1	111:11 112:15	debilitated 56:17
complied 39:22	consider 20:10 25:8	92:22 97:14,17	71:13 106:11	113:2 123:2,16	decades 43:12
comply 25:10,25	29:8 34:5 35:7	controllable 41:11	create 92:8 94:6	124:11,15	decide 47:7 114:24
components 105:5	43:17 47:8 51:7	controversy 57:18	109:20 110:6	dam 30:11 36:16,18	decided 57:2 115:14
comports 23:8	54:13 57:1,5,10,14	convened 44:4 50:14	112:11	36:20,21 40:17	deciding 46:8
computation 63:7,9	81:9,11 94:17 97:9	convenience 67:24	created 88:8	56:22 77:16	decision 27:2 32:2,25
73:15 81:25 83:15	101:22 114:19	convenient 67:25	creating 102:24	damaged 56:18	35:10,11,14 36:13
84:22,24 85:3 87:5	considerable 39:20	109:4 114:5	criteria 59:14 63:16	Damocles 36:9	38:20 54:10
89:7 93:10,17 97:22	consideration 22:5	converge 21:9	92:6 93:16 102:2	dams 42:15 43:3	decisions 35:7 36:14
98:22 99:3 102:19	81:24 107:12	conversation 30:13	114:3	125:23	53:9
107:24 110:7 120:7	considerations 46:11	convert 81:1	criterion 63:9 98:6	dangerous 118:11	declines 101:17
122:4	113:6	converts 85:1	critical 80:4 83:3	Daniel 2:10 3:3 1:14	deemed 19:12,15
computational 90:24	considered 29:15 31:7	cooperation 10:21	crosses 38:18	1:17 2:5,15,17,22	20:14 31:5
98:10 107:19	31:10,10 71:6 81:7	11:3,11,11 18:18	crossing 21:4 37:21	27:8,19 28:3,10	deep 44:23
computationally	87:6,11,17 102:3,20	cooperative 10:20	crucially 20:22	30:19 32:8,17 33:25	default 85:25
105:17 107:4	106:7 108:2	11:13 21:24 28:15	crystallise 49:24	34:6,13 42:20,22	define 63:10 86:16
				2.110,12 12.20,22	

	-	-	-	-	
defined 51:20 74:1	44:13 45:14 63:16	directly 10:8 89:23	doubling 114:12	126:11	78:17 81:22 83:9
80:16 83:19 120:21	114:3,4	103:12 105:19	doubt 19:7 43:1 47:15	each 64:12 70:12 88:3	96:3,4 101:12
defining 119:23	designed 85:22	discharge 65:4 66:3,5	49:21 51:19 128:10	90:21 91:3,9,10	108:10 109:4 110:7
definition 12:9,17	designing 42:14 43:3	66:16 67:15,19 68:5	down 3:14 23:16	92:9,12 94:15,25	114:11,12
62:20 64:8 71:9	63:23	73:16 76:8,9,10,13	46:20 56:22 82:18	95:4,20 102:7,12,19	endeavour 22:16
73:6,10,12 74:5,10	designs 21:9 24:19	76:16,18,21 77:1,4	112:3 120:25	104:1 106:25	endorsing 114:18
74:25 75:5,20,21	31:1 41:17 44:24	77:6 80:5,10 81:7	122:23 126:18	110:19,24 124:17	ends 96:2
76:7,14 77:3,12	despite 44:21 92:21	81:14,17,18 82:3,9	downstream 29:4	earlier 17:20 27:18	energy 60:10,16 61:15
80:19,22 81:3 82:7	detached 5:1	84:16 85:13,24 86:1	31:11,12 35:19	31:23 37:18 69:23	61:18,25 62:3,5
83:4,5,7,16 84:4	detail 4:17 38:8 39:11	86:13,18 88:2,5	36:15,16,18,21	73:20 84:11	63:5 65:9 67:22
85:8 113:1,12 114:6	42:11 51:13,14 71:4	89:21 90:8 94:12	37:15 38:2 39:1	early 5:3 26:15 33:1	70:25 72:6,11,16,18
114:8 115:18 118:5	98:21 109:12	95:3,19 96:9 101:5	77:19	95:23	72:21 73:1 79:8
119:13 120:15,16	126:23	101:25 105:20	Dr 1:11 2:11,14 5:9,11	easier 117:21	80:18 82:20,22
120:16	detailed 10:4 13:10,16	116:14 118:18	5:16,21 6:20,22	easily 31:13	84:18 85:2 87:24
definitions 74:12	13:22 18:10 21:7	119:3,5,8 121:7	19:22 49:4,11,14,20	Eastern 43:18,22	89:10,24,24 91:7
				45:11	
75:17 118:15	22:15 24:16,18	discharges 65:19	54:17 58:23 59:1,11		97:21 103:21,24
119:12 122:1	30:24,25 32:10,11	discovering 28:19	60:1,2 61:11,12	economic 61:5,13,19	104:4,13,16,23
degree 116:19	62:9	discrepancies 92:19	66:25 67:2,9,15	62:12 63:11 125:20	105:2,9 108:21,22
delay 56:18	details 17:10 89:5	103:3 106:4 107:17	72:14 73:9,20 81:18	125:24	108:23 109:8 110:1
deliberations 57:23	92:16 116:3,10	discuss 1:15 44:5	85:4 89:1 93:11	economy 24:20 31:2	110:12,13 121:25
deliver 50:18 90:9	detain 41:5	79:11	107:10 117:13	effect 6:2 12:5 15:24	engaged 57:9
delivered 69:9	detained 2:9	discussed 27:12 71:4	125:22 127:9,14	16:4,18 33:8 47:1	engagement 22:25
demand 60:12 104:2	detected 35:20	90:5 106:21	draft 2:22	55:11,12	engineer 59:17 63:18
125:18 126:1	determination 53:2	discussing 59:10	drafters 118:8	effective 45:13	73:7 82:11 85:5
demands 111:17	54:14 55:13 116:18	119:4 121:20	drafts 93:13	effectively 32:24	87:9 111:20 123:12
demonstrate 79:11	determine 39:14	discussion 6:6,8 31:17	drain 120:24	57:11 62:3 79:20	engineering 3:6 5:13
102:4	60:12 70:11 74:7	43:15 44:2 53:4	draw 26:9 55:15 120:2	92:25 99:21 100:4	5:15,18 11:23 12:6
demonstrated 85:4	77:19 80:5 88:3	71:12 72:23	drawdown 35:9,16,21	effectiveness 22:12	12:21 16:11 20:7,15
demonstrating 62:14	94:18 117:4 118:5	discussions 81:21	35:24 36:8 57:7,8	effects 53:6,8	20:18,25 21:7 22:15
demonstrative 37:6,8	determined 61:1,12	disinclination 45:2	drawn 46:7 57:22	efficiencies 79:17	24:13,16 26:21 28:2
37:10,11,25 38:8	64:7,9 68:1 70:8	dismissed 16:7	101:18 119:24	efficiency 73:23 74:13	29:13,20 30:24 32:7
39:11,25 40:21	73:17 86:4 90:19	dispatch 62:1 88:7	121:3	efficient 45:13 49:12	32:11,14,19,22 33:3
demonstratives 35:1	101:24	89:9 90:11 95:17	drew 28:17 37:18	effort 90:24 98:10	33:17 49:7 58:18
denotes 69:10	determines 87:24 91:8	dispatched 65:10 93:2	driven 29:11 78:7	107:19	71:7 72:5 77:24
density 73:21 74:13	determining 52:11	displayed 95:8 124:16	drop 120:25	efforts 92:21	83:18 84:5 119:20
78:9 79:15	develop 3:5 32:16	dispute 1:23,25 51:23	dropped 88:20 103:6	either 11:21,23 21:12	enlarge 36:25 37:1
depend 3:7 6:18 31:21	87:4 106:22 107:3	52:1 88:15	drops 122:17,19,20,23	29:13 37:14,17 49:5	enough 106:2 125:17
dependent 125:13	developed 92:11 93:14	disregard 43:9	dry 65:2 66:17,19	51:13 72:22 73:23	125:18
depending 5:7 86:4	93:15 94:8 100:21	disregarded 16:7	94:20 123:3	107:21 122:9	enquiry 4:22 5:1 10:9
89:25 95:21 98:18	103:6 107:25	distance 72:13,20	due 56:14	elaborate 4:20 47:11	59:6
99:14 102:13	developing 106:23	77:17 82:25	duration 64:18 67:21	82:16 108:21	ensure 66:21 70:24
105:25	development 16:14	distribute 104:5	86:11 91:8 94:2	elaboration 47:16	102:24
depends 49:11 112:16	22:22 37:23 98:25	distribution 97:21	102:13 103:12,14	elaborations 58:25	enter 37:21 123:19
120:11	99:1	104:7	103:22,24 104:2,17	element 7:10 16:13,14	entered 126:1
depth 126:13	diagram 60:1,8 65:21	divide 109:6	104:22,24 105:4,7	16:16	entering 109:17
Deputy 2:4,20	67:24	divided 7:9 58:23 90:8	105:10,15 106:6	elements 4:24 5:1 8:22	enters 125:20
derive 121:11	difference 61:21 79:18	divides 100:4	109:20 110:23	9:7,21 11:18 16:19	entire 55:8 110:2
derived 40:12 84:13	93:4 116:1 121:23	dividing 45:20 88:4	during 19:22 39:2	34:21 41:21 47:4	entirely 17:25 20:4
103:11 106:14	121:24	document 56:7 83:10	61:17 62:2 63:5	54:16 59:6,21	23:21
desanders 31:13,16	differences 116:6	118:12	65:7 66:7 68:7	103:25 106:10	entitled 24:23
described 24:17 41:8	121:20	documents 37:4 52:14	71:12 86:21 87:11	elevation 121:1	enumerated 59:22
69:22 90:21 99:2	different 19:23 53:13	116:19	88:18,19 89:11	eliminates 90:24	enumeration 18:6
107:20	54:5,6,8 75:16,17	doing 45:16 53:19	90:13 97:4 101:14	Embassy 2:8,9	environmental 23:13
describing 69:5	81:19 84:18 103:10	89:12 94:5 96:5	107:8 109:15	embedded 6:15 56:24	23:19 36:17 40:18
111:19	111:7 119:21 120:8	104:19 110:18	111:17,17 112:9,12	emerges 12:25	equal 63:12 64:4
description 68:8 71:15	126:25	123:14	124:23	emphasised 40:14	72:10,11 74:12
113:7	differently 119:22	domain 47:5	dusted 32:22	emphasising 11:22	76:10 78:23 88:2
descriptions 106:10	120:11	DON 1:11	duty 47:11 50:22 51:5	empty 35:21 120:23	90:7 98:7 103:21
		done 30:1 31:7 32:22	53:14	enable 12:4 15:23	104:13,15,23
design 5:19 9.4 14.12	difficult 61.7 110.1				
design 5:19 9:4 14:12 15:1 18:11 19:24.25	difficult 61:7 110:1 difficulties 93:15		dynamic 113.20	16:16:20 18:19	122:12
15:1 18:11 19:24,25	difficulties 93:15	66:1 72:12 79:21	dynamic 113:20	16:16,20 18:19 25:13 25 33:7 36:8	122:12 equally 46:11
15:1 18:11 19:24,25 20:7,8,18,25 21:1,4	difficulties 93:15 96:23 103:5 109:22	66:1 72:12 79:21 90:1,20,22 94:21		25:13,25 33:7 36:8	equally 46:11
15:1 18:11 19:24,25 20:7,8,18,25 21:1,4 21:8 22:15 23:3	difficulties 93:15 96:23 103:5 109:22 difficulty 100:11,14	66:1 72:12 79:21 90:1,20,22 94:21 97:25 101:19	E	25:13,25 33:7 36:8 40:17 45:14 106:2	equally 46:11 equals 76:18
15:1 18:11 19:24,25 20:7,8,18,25 21:1,4 21:8 22:15 23:3 24:13,16 25:3 26:21	difficulties 93:15 96:23 103:5 109:22 difficulty 100:11,14 102:3,10	66:1 72:12 79:21 90:1,20,22 94:21 97:25 101:19 103:13 110:24	E E 7:11 48:14 49:2 69:5	25:13,25 33:7 36:8 40:17 45:14 106:2 enables 61:24 62:1	equally 46:11 equals 76:18 equate 89:25
15:1 18:11 19:24,25 20:7,8,18,25 21:1,4 21:8 22:15 23:3 24:13,16 25:3 26:21 28:2 29:20 30:24	difficulties 93:15 96:23 103:5 109:22 difficulty 100:11,14 102:3,10 dimensions 74:14	66:1 72:12 79:21 90:1,20,22 94:21 97:25 101:19 103:13 110:24 112:25 119:22	E E 7:11 48:14 49:2 69:5 89:6 90:18,23	25:13,25 33:7 36:8 40:17 45:14 106:2 enables 61:24 62:1 63:5 67:20	equally 46:11 equals 76:18 equate 89:25 equation 73:18,19
15:1 18:11 19:24,25 20:7,8,18,25 21:1,4 21:8 22:15 23:3 24:13,16 25:3 26:21 28:2 29:20 30:24 32:7,11,14,16,19,22	difficulties 93:15 96:23 103:5 109:22 difficulty 100:11,14 102:3,10 dimensions 74:14 diminished 1:8	66:1 72:12 79:21 90:1,20,22 94:21 97:25 101:19 103:13 110:24 112:25 119:22 128:6	E E 7:11 48:14 49:2 69:5 89:6 90:18,23 119:10,12,19,22	25:13,25 33:7 36:8 40:17 45:14 106:2 enables 61:24 62:1 63:5 67:20 enabling 17:7 22:6	equally 46:11 equals 76:18 equate 89:25 equation 73:18,19 74:19 76:5 77:2
15:1 18:11 19:24,25 20:7,8,18,25 21:1,4 21:8 22:15 23:3 24:13,16 25:3 26:21 28:2 29:20 30:24 32:7,11,14,16,19,22 33:3,17 36:6 41:13	difficulties 93:15 96:23 103:5 109:22 difficulty 100:11,14 102:3,10 dimensions 74:14 diminished 1:8 direct 91:2,18 120:6	66:1 72:12 79:21 90:1,20,22 94:21 97:25 101:19 103:13 110:24 112:25 119:22 128:6 dots 18:22	E E 7:11 48:14 49:2 69:5 89:6 90:18,23 119:10,12,19,22 120:8,17 121:9,14	25:13,25 33:7 36:8 40:17 45:14 106:2 enables 61:24 62:1 63:5 67:20 enabling 17:7 22:6 25:19	equally 46:11 equals 76:18 equate 89:25 equation 73:18,19 74:19 76:5 77:2 78:17 86:19 110:8
15:1 18:11 19:24,25 20:7,8,18,25 21:1,4 21:8 22:15 23:3 24:13,16 25:3 26:21 28:2 29:20 30:24 32:7,11,14,16,19,22 33:3,17 36:6 41:13 41:14 42:6 43:13,18	difficulties 93:15 96:23 103:5 109:22 difficulty 100:11,14 102:3,10 dimensions 74:14 diminished 1:8 direct 91:2,18 120:6 direction 1:10	66:1 72:12 79:21 90:1,20,22 94:21 97:25 101:19 103:13 110:24 112:25 119:22 128:6 dots 18:22 double 115:5 118:1	E 7:11 48:14 49:2 69:5 89:6 90:18,23 119:10,12,19,22 120:8,17 121:9,14 121:18 122:3,5,8	25:13,25 33:7 36:8 40:17 45:14 106:2 enables 61:24 62:1 63:5 67:20 enabling 17:7 22:6 25:19 encompass 8:8	equally 46:11 equals 76:18 equate 89:25 equation 73:18,19 74:19 76:5 77:2 78:17 86:19 110:8 122:24
15:1 18:11 19:24,25 20:7,8,18,25 21:1,4 21:8 22:15 23:3 24:13,16 25:3 26:21 28:2 29:20 30:24 32:7,11,14,16,19,22 33:3,17 36:6 41:13	difficulties 93:15 96:23 103:5 109:22 difficulty 100:11,14 102:3,10 dimensions 74:14 diminished 1:8 direct 91:2,18 120:6	66:1 72:12 79:21 90:1,20,22 94:21 97:25 101:19 103:13 110:24 112:25 119:22 128:6 dots 18:22	E E 7:11 48:14 49:2 69:5 89:6 90:18,23 119:10,12,19,22 120:8,17 121:9,14	25:13,25 33:7 36:8 40:17 45:14 106:2 enables 61:24 62:1 63:5 67:20 enabling 17:7 22:6 25:19	equally 46:11 equals 76:18 equate 89:25 equation 73:18,19 74:19 76:5 77:2 78:17 86:19 110:8

equivalent 69:25	exhibits 34:25 36:23	fairly 3:19	flawed 54:14	Emidon 2:12 6:24	36:16 39:7 53:8
-				Friday 3:12 6:24	
82:14,15 86:7 91:3	37:2,3 40:21,22	faith 19:13 22:25	flaws 98:2	28:12 29:23 55:2	60:13 64:8,13 66:18
121:25	exhortation 15:19	31:21	flexibility 65:8 115:13	95:17 101:7	67:24 69:4 72:21
erroneous 98:5	exist 9:4 14:25 25:3	fall 22:17 93:21	115:17 126:20	front 39:6 50:16 128:2	75:9,10 76:1 78:21
error 101:15 125:2	existing 71:3	falls 19:9 112:17	flowchart 36:25	full 66:9 90:19 98:25	80:19 81:15 83:6,24
errors 88:21 92:18,20	expansion 62:9	familiar 11:7 13:2	flowing 38:3,6	101:4 105:2	85:6,8 93:5 97:15
98:4 103:8 106:5	expect 2:10,24 5:5,21	far 3:3 22:18 29:5	flows 38:4,11 40:18	fuller 34:24,24	105:23 106:11
107:16	6:24 49:19 65:23	35:20	64:23 66:8 67:23	fully 3:19 38:3 103:6	115:13 123:10
especially 44:5 66:18	expectation 31:4	fatal 98:2	68:2,2,3,11 85:17	103:25	125:16
84:9	expected 68:9	FATIMA 2:8	92:25 94:16 96:10	function 69:22 89:11	gives 27:21 65:19 73:5
essence 11:16 60:11	expecting 2:7 21:11	feasibility 20:6,13	100:13 106:24,24	91:7 100:21 105:7	73:14 77:14 82:23
112:11	expedited 4:24	29:18,24 31:24 62:6	107:8,13,14 123:5	114:9	82:25 90:8,11 97:1
essential 106:25	experience 6:23 62:19	Federal 2:7 7:16	flow/environmental	functions 10:19	101:25 109:8 114:3
essentially 18:14	92:20	feeds 77:2	35:13	fundamentally 54:14	124:12
75:13 87:16 110:11	experienced 59:16	feel 34:17 117:12	fluctuate 126:22	80:4	giving 21:10 78:25
	-	119:9		furnishing 10:16	
110:12 119:16	85:5 87:8 93:15		fluid 78:9 79:15		81:17,17
Essex 2:10,11	Expert 7:5 47:4,17	feels 118:5	flushing 35:9,16,21,21	further 6:25 25:17	glasses 59:20
establish 9:5 10:19	50:4,7,11,15 51:1,2	feet 5:6,21	35:24 36:1,8 57:7,8	34:6,8 38:2 40:8	go 1:19 3:23 8:23
15:1 25:3	51:6,10,19 52:7,10	few 38:23 64:15 90:5	focus 5:13 6:2 13:15	47:15 49:16,24 51:7	11:17 21:12 22:10
establishes 84:24	52:14,16 53:4,11,15	Fietta 2:12,12,13,13	36:24 37:1	55:20 59:2 73:8	31:23 32:2 34:16
estimate 124:25	55:10,12,19,25	2:14 5:25 6:10,12	focused 10:5 11:3	74:10 79:13 117:10	37:2 38:9 39:11
et 73:25 78:10	56:21 87:14 92:23	fifth 14:13 20:7	122:5	122:14 128:11	41:23 42:21 65:20
evaluate 17:7	93:5 99:17 100:10	figure 39:8 60:20	focusing 121:15	furthers 21:22	67:13 73:6 74:16,19
evaluated 69:24	116:21	84:10 89:23 95:7	follow 27:21 77:22	future 11:9,11	78:12,23 79:12 81:3
evaluation 24:23	Expert's 50:24 52:4	96:22	83:7		81:18 86:8 91:19
even 20:13 29:24 41:2	53:1 56:6	figures 39:5	followed 5:9 6:12,20	G	93:23 94:16 95:6,21
57:11 63:22 79:23	explain 64:15 71:24	filed 50:13	following 4:4,7 8:23		97:11,23 110:5
	95:10	final 7:19 20:7 27:7	0	G 1:1	-
96:6 100:5 118:7,15			9:8,22 35:18 41:22	GARTH 2:20	111:4,11,23 112:25
evening 128:10	explanation 87:3	34:20 35:14 36:12	54:1 75:24 81:5,15	gauge 37:12	113:8 114:2 115:8
event 46:12 51:4,22,23	91:23	36:14 38:20 39:22	91:20 114:14 123:8	gauging 38:10,13,16	117:11 119:25
every 91:6	explanations 58:25	40:19 45:22 53:3,22	128:15	38:24 39:13	127:20
everyone 1:6 58:14	explicit 81:6	57:6	follows 25:6 97:1,2	gave 103:4 113:19	goal 21:24
evidence 13:18 14:5	explicitly 92:7 107:2	finali[sing 20:8	follow-up 82:4 109:10	general 2:7,20 14:13	goes 10:18 20:1 56:12
36:2 41:18 45:1	explore 29:8	finally 9:17 15:3	force 72:12	15:10 17:12 18:11	56:12,13 61:4 74:25
evident 35:23 45:10	express 20:24 68:21	118:23	forecast 60:12	23:9,10,11 43:10	going 8:10 14:20
evolution 118:22	expressed 11:12,13	financial 62:13	Foreign 2:6	47:11 50:22 51:5	18:22 24:22 28:14
evolved 118:13	41:9,12 72:4 79:2	find 8:22 9:7,21 13:13	forget 114:7	53:14 72:6 84:1,4	29:3 31:17 33:16,19
exactly 43:18 106:13	81:8 83:15 119:3	34:21 41:21 103:2	Forgive 8:10		41:4 42:12 48:15
110:7	expressly 24:4 27:1	105:1,3	form 4:13 24:17 30:25	86:25 112:6 113:7	49:12 50:17,25
examination 97:4	expropriate 45:17	finds 28:18	54:13 73:18 109:15	generally 53:9 97:5	51:15 56:1,2,20,21
example 4:18 15:13	extended 91:1	fine 2:13 33:22 34:4	formal 7:19	111:23 125:5	56:23 57:2,8 58:15
			formally 39:23 127:18	generate 94:5 122:21	
22:18 23:15 25:21	extension 91:2,18 92:4	34:11 46:6 57:22	e e	generated 72:1	59:18 64:21 80:9,10
29:10 36:1 44:3,16	118:15	58:7	formatting 66:1	generating 73:23 74:4	91:17,19 92:24
57:3,6 72:2 81:11	external 108:7	finish 91:14	formed 20:15	74:4 86:4 88:8	93:12,23 94:4,18
82:7 83:3 95:7,15	extraneous 75:25 83:8	finished 91:25	formula 74:4 113:11	90:11 95:1,3 100:15	99:4 102:5,16 107:7
103:4 109:23	85:13	first 1:7 2:8,9 3:25 4:3	113:22 114:21	101:7 112:23	108:17 113:23
113:19 120:23	extraordinary 101:15	4:25 7:6,8,10 10:2	formulating 16:11	generation 36:17	118:1 122:3
examples 43:25	extremely 103:2	11:19 14:10 16:13	forward 30:6 55:19	60:11 62:9 67:21	gone 3:4 105:15
exceed 126:8	122:11 128:7	17:11,24 20:4,21	64:16 67:13 79:12	70:22 82:22 88:3	good 1:6,18 2:4 19:13
exceeded 103:20	eye 63:24	24:14 25:8 27:15	80:24		22:25 31:21 48:3
		24:14 25:8 27:15 33:18 35:7,17 39:25	80:24 foul 22:18	89:11 100:23	
exceeded 103:20	eye 63:24			89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21	22:25 31:21 48:3
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16	eye 63:24 E1 65:25	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 <u>F</u> F 50:14 52:2,12	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25 facilitating 10:22 11:4	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19 exchanged 8:21 14:24	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25 facilitating 10:22 11:4	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4 first-round 3:20 6:5	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6 64:17	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17 greater 67:19 68:3,4
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19 exchanged 8:21 14:24 17:2 19:3 24:7,11	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25 facilitating 10:22 11:4 facilities 69:4	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4 first-round 3:20 6:5 42:11	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6 64:17 framework 36:4	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20 getting 23:25 48:2	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17 greater 67:19 68:3,4 126:21 127:1
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19 exchanged 8:21 14:24 17:2 19:3 24:7,11 32:10	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25 facilitating 10:22 11:4 facilities 69:4 fact 2:9 3:18 7:5 17:17 28:15,17 31:13 38:6	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4 first-round 3:20 6:5	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6 64:17	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20 getting 23:25 48:2 54:21 67:8 126:23 give 21:8 22:15 34:8	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17 greater 67:19 68:3,4
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 except 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19 exchanged 8:21 14:24 17:2 19:3 24:7,11	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25 facilitating 10:22 11:4 fact 2:9 3:18 7:5 17:17 28:15,17 31:13 38:6 39:19 44:21 52:8	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4 first-round 3:20 6:5 42:11	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6 64:17 framework 36:4	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20 getting 23:25 48:2 54:21 67:8 126:23 give 21:8 22:15 34:8 34:23,25 45:25	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17 greater 67:19 68:3,4 126:21 127:1
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpt 125:10 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19 exchanged 8:21 14:24 17:2 19:3 24:7,11 32:10	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25 facilitating 10:22 11:4 facilities 69:4 fact 2:9 3:18 7:5 17:17 28:15,17 31:13 38:6 39:19 44:21 52:8 92:17 98:25 106:17	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4 first-round 3:20 6:5 42:11 fit 72:21 114:14	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6 64:17 framework 36:4 framing 35:2	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20 getting 23:25 48:2 54:21 67:8 126:23 give 21:8 22:15 34:8 34:23,25 45:25 49:15 56:11 65:15	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granpic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17 greater 67:19 68:3,4 126:21 127:1 greatly 128:11
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 except 125:10 excerpt 125:10 excerpt 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19 exchanged 8:21 14:24 17:2 19:3 24:7,11 32:10 exclude 96:8 excuse 61:7 91:13	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25 facilitating 10:22 11:4 fact 2:9 3:18 7:5 17:17 28:15,17 31:13 38:6 39:19 44:21 52:8 92:17 98:25 106:17 factor 118:21	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4 first-round 3:20 6:5 42:11 fit 72:21 114:14 five 14:6,10 20:1,3,9	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6 64:17 framework 36:4 framing 35:2 free 1:18 117:12 119:9	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20 getting 23:25 48:2 54:21 67:8 126:23 give 21:8 22:15 34:8 34:23,25 45:25 49:15 56:11 65:15 65:16 75:16 76:15	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17 greater 67:19 68:3,4 126:21 127:1 greatly 128:11 green 66:9,12,24 67:7
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 except 71:20 excerpt 125:10 excerpt 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19 exchanged 8:21 14:24 17:2 19:3 24:7,11 32:10 exclude 96:8 excuse 61:7 91:13 exercise 33:12 55:8	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25 facilitating 10:22 11:4 facilities 69:4 fact 2:9 3:18 7:5 17:17 28:15,17 31:13 38:6 39:19 44:21 52:8 92:17 98:25 106:17 factor 118:21 factors 23:1 80:8	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4 first-round 3:20 6:5 42:11 fit 72:21 114:14 five 14:6,10 20:1,3,9 29:16 39:16 119:5	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6 64:17 framework 36:4 framing 35:2 free 1:18 117:12 119:9 freeboard 54:16	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20 getting 23:25 48:2 54:21 67:8 126:23 give 21:8 22:15 34:8 34:23,25 45:25 49:15 56:11 65:15 65:16 75:16 76:15 77:18 82:1,22 89:6	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17 greater 67:19 68:3,4 126:21 127:1 greatly 128:11 greent 66:9,12,24 67:7 GREGORY 2:14 grey 95:17
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 exception 44:9 excerpted 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19 exchanged 8:21 14:24 17:2 19:3 24:7,11 32:10 exclude 96:8 exclude 96:8 exclude 96:8 exclude 95:8 exclude 33:12 55:8 exhibit 2:1 37:5,10	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{eye} \ 63:24 \\ \textbf{E1} \ 65:25 \\ \textbf{E2} \ 80:3 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \textbf{F} \\ \textbf{F} \ 50:14 \ 52:2,12 \\ \textbf{face} \ 45:13 \ 63:19 \ 103:8 \\ \textbf{faced} \ 52:7,10 \ 83:10 \\ \textbf{facilitate} \ 22:6,25 \\ \textbf{facilitating} \ 10:22 \ 11:4 \\ \textbf{facilities} \ 69:4 \\ \textbf{fact} \ 2:9 \ 3.18 \ 7:5 \ 17:17 \\ 28:15,17 \ 31:13 \ 38:6 \\ 39:19 \ 44:21 \ 52:8 \\ 92:17 \ 98:25 \ 106:17 \\ \textbf{factor} \ 118:21 \\ \textbf{factors} \ 23:1 \ 80:8 \\ \textbf{facts} \ 10:24 \ 18:20 \\ \end{array}$	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4 first-round 3:20 6:5 42:11 fit 72:21 114:14 five 14:6,10 20:1,3,9 29:16 39:16 119:5 five-step 7:13 47:24 fix 63:20	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6 64:17 framework 36:4 framing 35:2 free 1:18 117:12 119:9 freeboard 54:16 frequency 38:21 65:17 68:4	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20 getting 23:25 48:2 54:21 67:8 126:23 give 21:8 22:15 34:8 34:23,25 45:25 49:15 56:11 65:15 65:16 75:16 76:15 77:18 82:1,22 89:6 99:6,18,22 104:6,6	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17 greater 67:19 68:3,4 126:21 127:1 greatly 128:11 green 66:9,12,24 67:7 GREGORY 2:14 grey 95:17 grid 71:3
exceeded 103:20 exceeds 36:19 63:6 65:3 103:16 except 71:20 except 71:20 excerpt 125:10 excerpt 69:17 76:15 exchange 10:4,5,16 11:3 13:11 18:9 22:4 24:8,9 72:24 117:19 exchanged 8:21 14:24 17:2 19:3 24:7,11 32:10 exclude 96:8 excuse 61:7 91:13 exercise 33:12 55:8	eye 63:24 E1 65:25 E2 80:3 F 50:14 52:2,12 face 45:13 63:19 103:8 faced 52:7,10 83:10 facilitate 22:6,25 facilitating 10:22 11:4 facilities 69:4 fact 2:9 3:18 7:5 17:17 28:15,17 31:13 38:6 39:19 44:21 52:8 92:17 98:25 106:17 factor 118:21 factors 23:1 80:8	33:18 35:7,17 39:25 44:3 47:23 49:19 56:9 59:23 62:18 63:1 69:19 74:25 86:10 93:24 94:3 98:3 108:13 114:11 116:20 121:23 127:10,14 firstly 73:10 85:20 90:4 first-round 3:20 6:5 42:11 fit 72:21 114:14 five 14:6,10 20:1,3,9 29:16 39:16 119:5 five-step 7:13 47:24	foul 22:18 found 12:9 97:5 125:25 foundation 5:15 121:22 foundational 87:7,20 88:16 91:4 four 5:24 59:20,21 60:9 124:16 fourth 14:12 20:6 64:17 framework 36:4 framing 35:2 free 1:18 117:12 119:9 freeboard 54:16 frequency 38:21 65:17	89:11 100:23 101:10 102:12,21 102:22 105:25 107:22 117:5 generators 73:24 geographically 18:10 geometry 104:25 Georgina 1:23 gets 29:16 101:3 122:20 getting 23:25 48:2 54:21 67:8 126:23 give 21:8 22:15 34:8 34:23,25 45:25 49:15 56:11 65:15 65:16 75:16 76:15 77:18 82:1,22 89:6	22:25 31:21 48:3 57:24 58:8 91:21 111:5 127:4 128:5 grabbing 126:10 granted 55:20 granular 16:25 33:23 graphic 89:16 grateful 1:13 gravitational 73:21 gravity 74:13 78:10 79:17 greater 67:19 68:3,4 126:21 127:1 greatly 128:11 greent 66:9,12,24 67:7 GREGORY 2:14 grey 95:17

grips 82:5	high 88:22 97:8 105:9	identifying 122:7	44:23 45:5,5,14,16	85:14,17 105:22	107:16
ground 4:25 8:2	higher 61:6,15 97:5	ignore 100:14	50:12 56:22 63:9,14	108:8 123:13,25	interrelationship 70:6
group 58:5 99:10	highly 43:1	II 14:4,6 16:24 17:6	63:20,23 64:10 65:6	124:12	interrupted 48:5
grouped 58:6	high-peak 111:17	17:12 18:6,8,14	65:8 66:21 69:6	information-sharing	intractable 102:16
guard 46:19	him 2:10 6:25 49:15	69:4	76:24 79:22 85:3	4:13,19 8:5,8,19	intra-day 81:12
5					
guess 110:10	50:16 54:21	illustrate 59:23 60:2,7	91:6 92:23 93:4	10:3,11 13:5,9,14	introduces 95:4
guidance 33:24 34:8	Himalayan 60:3	80:14 93:13,14,16	99:17 114:6 115:12	13:17 14:14,22	invariably 41:1
51:7	historically 40:10	104:11	121:17 122:17	18:18 19:1 21:19	101:12,14
guided 23:10	history 1:24	illustrated 60:18 63:4	123:17	23:7,18,23 26:11	inveigled 54:19
guidelines 44:21	hold 49:13 115:6	67:23 84:10,23	Indian 24:17 32:19	27:11 28:6 37:19	invite 2:15
Gulland 1:23	126:10	89:16 99:19 103:15	35:3 38:19 39:24	informs 81:24	involved 19:24 62:14
	home 111:11	illustrates 66:14 96:22	40:2.7.14 42:5 44:7	initial 15:7	94:19 103:5 108:5
Н	hope 1:6,17 7:25	illustrating 80:16	44:9 124:2	initially 28:21	115:23 116:11,12
	18:22 25:6 33:23	illustration 60:25	India's 4:14 17:16	input 5:18	involvement 116:9
Hague 1:5	41:5 83:14 117:15	65:16 106:17	22:17 26:19 27:2	inputs 60:11 105:21	involves 94:8 96:13,18
half 7:21 37:1 94:21				-	
115:16	128:9	images 42:6	28:19 29:25 31:18	Inshallah 7:15	irregularities 107:14
HAMDIA 2:8	hopefully 49:15	imagine 76:23	31:22 35:5,8,12	insight 27:22	irrelevant 78:3,4,5,20
hand 5:8	horizontal 60:19,24	immediately 34:14	36:1,6 37:13 39:14	insignificant 124:7	irritant 43:7
handed 23:16 37:9	103:19	38:18 53:11 86:23	41:16,19 42:18 43:6	insofar 51:4	Islamabad 2:10
handing 3:13 46:20	horror 42:25	immensely 47:14	44:14 45:2,8,10	inspection 10:23 11:4	Islamic 1:16 2:2 3:2
handling 105:18	hortatory 15:18	imperative 45:8	51:14 55:7 111:6	18:19 26:12,18,22	2:21
0	hour 34:15 115:16	implementation 20:22	121:14	40:16,25	isolated 71:2
handout 5:24	hourly 38:21 39:6	implications 29:3	indicate 48:12 51:9	installed 55:6 61:6,12	issue 5:20 24:6 26:25
hanging 36:10					
happen 27:18 30:14	hours 78:22 82:21	46:22 47:13 119:17	127:21	61:21 63:10,13 64:3	27:9,23,24 35:16
30:14,18	86:4 88:3,8 89:20	implied 100:13	indicated 3:13,15	64:10 66:5,8 69:12	36:11 37:3,5 41:4,8
happened 29:5,6	90:9,13 95:1,3	implies 16:19 17:19	39:25 61:22 66:22	69:21 70:5 88:10	48:18 50:1 53:8,10
118:24	100:15 101:8,24	importance 40:15	100:7 107:25	93:3,7 107:22	53:17 55:21 57:2
happening 27:17	104:5 105:12,25	126:4	indicates 42:10 127:25	121:21 122:6,8,9,13	73:3
happens 49:15 56:19	109:7 113:18,19	important 10:9 13:24	indicating 37:8 70:3	instance 76:24	issued 54:3 55:11
124:13	115:14 117:5,24,25	47:14 51:3 62:19,23	101:2 104:11	instances 28:18 39:6	issues 3:6 4:25 5:4,20
happy 34:6 48:24 49:9	123:23	85:20 94:17 98:17	individual 97:25	instantaneous 72:14	6:1,14 7:4 8:14
	housekeeping 1:20 2:5	112:10 116:15	102:14	instantaneously 72:14	10:22 23:19 27:11
78:18 127:15,19,20	2:14	125:15	indulgence 48:3	76:25	27:17 35:5 39:23
hard 15:17 128:8			5	insufficiently 32:18	
harm 23:14	hydraulic 14:12 18:10	Importantly 59:10	Indus 1:2 2:5 10:14	e e	46:1,3,3,7 47:10
having 1:18 5:24	69:1	imposed 99:12	41:14 44:20 45:9,19	intakes 6:13 116:12	51:2,17 57:9,20
17:14 36:4 41:15	hydroelectric 73:11	imposing 103:1	122:18	integrated 71:3	58:18 59:2,23 77:24
53:7 74:1 102:21	73:17 74:2 76:20	impractical 92:14	industry 24:17 83:18	intended 12:20 14:15	item 79:3
118:13	78:21 125:8		100.10	00 6 04 14 00 00	
110.15		inaugurated 35:4	122:12	22:6 24:14 30:23	items 59:9,11,21 69:9
	hydroengineering	inclination 3:5	inferred 92:6	22:6 24:14 30:23 intensive 107:5	items 59:9,11,21 69:9 74:9 121:11
Hayat 19:22		inclination 3:5	inferred 92:6		
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7	hydroengineering 84:17	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19	74:9 121:11
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,116 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 join 29:2 join 22:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8
Hayat 19:22 head $36:10$ 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interfere 19:6	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interfere 19:6 interference 11:24	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1
Hayat 19:22 head $36:10$ 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropwer 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17 14:1 15:1,3,13,15	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interestingl 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22
Hayat 19:22 head $36:10$ 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropwer 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17 14:1 15:1,3,13,15 17:15,22 18:17 19:4	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interesting 106:5,12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 international 23:9,11	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropwer 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17 14:1 15:1,3,13,15	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interestingl 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9
Hayat 19:22 head $36:10$ 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropwer 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17 14:1 15:1,3,13,15 17:15,22 18:17 19:4	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interesting 106:5,12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 international 23:9,11	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 61:15 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17 14:1 15:1,3,13,15 17:15,22 18:17 19:4 19:11,14 20:10,14 20:17 21:6 24:12	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20 16:25 17:1,2,5,5,6,8 17:12,14,17,19 18:1	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interfere 19:6 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 international 23:9,11 23:12,15 72:7,8 74:18	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{inclination 3:5} \\ \textbf{include } 24:14 \ 61:15 \\ 63:16 \ 102:6 \ 105:16 \\ 106:23 \ 116:10 \\ \textbf{included } 69:12 \ 89:6 \\ 107:23 \\ \textbf{includes } 75:22 \ 87:6 \\ \textbf{including } 10:21 \ 18:19 \\ 34:25 \ 47:1,16 \ 65:16 \\ \textbf{incompatible } 83:4 \\ \textbf{increased } 41:11 \\ \textbf{increases } 105:10 \\ \textbf{indeed } 3:14 \ 5:2 \ 11:12 \\ 21:20 \ 25:8 \ 29:21 \\ 33:10 \ 41:1 \ 58:1 \\ \textbf{India } 1:18 \ 2:17 \ 9:5,17 \\ 14:1 \ 15:1,3,13,15 \\ 17:15,22 \ 18:17 \ 19:4 \\ 19:11,14 \ 20:10,14 \\ 20:17 \ 21:6 \ 24:12 \\ 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 \\ \end{array}$	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:47,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20 16:25 17:1,2,5,6,8 17:12,14,17,19 18:1 18:6,8,9,13,13,15	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interface 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 international 23:9,11 23:12,15 72:7,8 74:18 interpret 63:18 85:14	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{inclination 3:5} \\ \textbf{include } 24:14 \ 61:15 \\ 63:16 \ 102:6 \ 105:16 \\ 106:23 \ 116:10 \\ \textbf{included } 69:12 \ 89:6 \\ 107:23 \\ \textbf{includes } 75:22 \ 87:6 \\ \textbf{including } 10:21 \ 18:19 \\ 34:25 \ 47:1,16 \ 65:16 \\ \textbf{incompatible } 83:4 \\ \textbf{increased } 41:11 \\ \textbf{increases } 105:10 \\ \textbf{indeed } 3:14 \ 5:2 \ 11:12 \\ 21:20 \ 25:8 \ 29:21 \\ 33:10 \ 41:1 \ 58:1 \\ \textbf{India } 1:18 \ 2:17 \ 9:5,17 \\ 14:1 \ 15:1,3,13,15 \\ 17:15,22 \ 18:17 \ 19:4 \\ 19:11,14 \ 20:10,14 \\ 20:17 \ 21:6 \ 24:12 \\ 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 \\ 26:2,13,16 \ 27:5 \\ \end{array}$	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20 16:25 17:1,2,5,5,6,8 17:12,14,17,19 18:1 18:6,8,9,13,13,15 19:2,5,10 20:11	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeable 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interfere 19:6 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:1,5 72:7,8 74:18 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joule 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16 25:3,5 41:17 42:6	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7 <u>I</u>	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{inclination 3:5} \\ \textbf{include } 24:14 \ 61:15 \\ 63:16 \ 102:6 \ 105:16 \\ 106:23 \ 116:10 \\ \textbf{included } 69:12 \ 89:6 \\ 107:23 \\ \textbf{includes } 75:22 \ 87:6 \\ \textbf{including } 10:21 \ 18:19 \\ 34:25 \ 47:1,16 \ 65:16 \\ \textbf{incompatible } 83:4 \\ \textbf{increase } 105:10 \\ \textbf{indeed } 3:14 \ 5:2 \ 11:12 \\ 21:20 \ 25:8 \ 29:21 \\ 33:10 \ 41:1 \ 58:1 \\ \textbf{India } 1:18 \ 2:17 \ 9:5,17 \\ 14:1 \ 15:1,3,13,15 \\ 17:15,22 \ 18:17 \ 19:4 \\ 19:11,14 \ 20:10,14 \\ 20:17 \ 21:6 \ 24:12 \\ 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 \\ 26:2,13,16 \ 27:5 \\ 28:1,8,24 \ 29:7,18 \\ \end{array}$	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20 16:25 17:1,2,5,6,8 17:12,14,17,19 18:1 18:6,8,9,13,13,15 19:2,5,10 20:11 21:6 22:1,4,14 24:6	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interfere 19:6 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 international 23:9,11 23:12,15 72:7,8 74:18 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21 interpretation 6:14	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joint 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5 26:9 27:9,12 30:15
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16 25:3,5 41:17 42:6 43:22	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7 <u>I</u> idea 31:19 94:6	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{inclination 3:5} \\ \textbf{include } 24:14 \ 61:15 \\ 63:16 \ 102:6 \ 105:16 \\ 106:23 \ 116:10 \\ \textbf{included } 69:12 \ 89:6 \\ 107:23 \\ \textbf{includes } 75:22 \ 87:6 \\ \textbf{including } 10:21 \ 18:19 \\ 34:25 \ 47:1,16 \ 65:16 \\ \textbf{incompatible } 83:4 \\ \textbf{increased } 41:11 \\ \textbf{increases } 105:10 \\ \textbf{indeed } 3:14 \ 5:2 \ 11:12 \\ 21:20 \ 25:8 \ 29:21 \\ 33:10 \ 41:1 \ 58:1 \\ \textbf{India } 1:18 \ 2:17 \ 9:5,17 \\ 14:1 \ 15:1,3,13,15 \\ 17:15,22 \ 18:17 \ 19:4 \\ 19:11,14 \ 20:10,14 \\ 20:17 \ 21:6 \ 24:12 \\ 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 \\ 26:2,13,16 \ 27:5 \\ 28:1,8,24 \ 29:7,18 \\ 30:2,7 \ 31:5,18 \ 32:3 \\ \end{array}$	inferred 92:6 inflow $36:18,19,21$ 39:15 $76:25$ $88:1990:12$ $95:15$ $99:20100:9$ $101:23110:13inflows 37:21influence 23:1 124:9125:15inform 12:4 15:2316:17$ $20:19$ $22:1333:8$ $59:9$ $71:8114:9information 8:2010:17$ $11:3$ $13:9,1113:23$ $14:4,7,10,1314:15,23$ $15:8,9,1415:15,19$ $16:9,15,2016:25$ $17:12,5,6,6.817:12,14,17,19$ $18:118:68,9,13,13,1519:2,5,10$ $20:1121:6$ $22:1,4,14$ $24:624:8,9,11,22$ $26:16$	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interesting 125:23 interfere 19:6 interfere 19:6 interfere 19:6 interfere 19:6 interfere 19:6 interfere 19:6 interfere 19:7 interfere 19:8 interfere 19:8 i	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 join 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5 26:9 27:9,12 30:15 31:19 32:18 33:22
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16 25:3,5 41:17 42:6 43:22	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7 <u>I</u>	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{inclination 3:5} \\ \textbf{include } 24:14 \ 61:15 \\ 63:16 \ 102:6 \ 105:16 \\ 106:23 \ 116:10 \\ \textbf{included } 69:12 \ 89:6 \\ 107:23 \\ \textbf{includes } 75:22 \ 87:6 \\ \textbf{includes } 75:22 \ 87:6 \\ \textbf{including } 10:21 \ 18:19 \\ 34:25 \ 47:1,16 \ 65:16 \\ \textbf{incompatible } 83:4 \\ \textbf{increased } 41:11 \\ \textbf{increases } 105:10 \\ \textbf{indeed } 3:14 \ 5:2 \ 11:12 \\ 21:20 \ 25:8 \ 29:21 \\ 33:10 \ 41:1 \ 58:1 \\ \textbf{India } 1:18 \ 2:17 \ 9:5,17 \\ 14:1 \ 15:1,3,13,15 \\ 17:15,22 \ 18:17 \ 19:4 \\ 19:11,14 \ 20:10,14 \\ 20:17 \ 21:6 \ 24:12 \\ 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 \\ 26:2,13,16 \ 27:5 \\ 28:1,8,24 \ 29:7,18 \\ 30:2,7 \ 31:5,18 \ 32:3 \\ 32:6 \ 33:5,12 \ 34:19 \\ \end{array}$	inferred 92:6 inflow $36:18,19,21$ 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 influence $23:1 124:9$ 125:15 inform $12:4 15:23$ 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information $8:20$ 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20 16:25 17:1,2,5,5,6,8 17:12,14,17,19 18:1 18:68,9,13,13,15 19:2,5,10 20:11 21:6 22:1,4,14 24:6 24:8,9,11,22 26:16 26:20 28:20 30:21	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{intensive } 107:5 \\ \textbf{inter } 28:19 \\ \textbf{inter } 10:16 \ 52:5 \\ \textbf{interact } 64:5 \\ \textbf{interaction } 26:10 \\ \textbf{interacts } 64:2 \\ \textbf{interchangeable } 68:21 \\ 71:7 \\ \textbf{interchangeable } 75:3 \\ 75:12,16 \\ \textbf{interest } 3:6 \ 70:2 \\ \textbf{interesting } 125:23 \\ \textbf{interesting } 125:23 \\ \textbf{interesting } 106:5,12 \\ \textbf{interference } 11:24 \\ 12:7,9,12,24 \ 16:12 \\ \textbf{interference } 13:6 \\ 11:23:12,15 \ 72:7,8 \\ 74:18 \\ \textbf{interpret } 63:18 \ 85:14 \\ 85:21 \\ \textbf{interpretation } 6:14 \\ 21:15,16 \ 22:13 \ 27:3 \\ 54:7 \ 56:11 \ 66:20 \\ \end{array}$	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joint 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5 26:9 27:9,12 30:15
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16 25:3,5 41:17 42:6 43:22	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7 <u>I</u> idea 31:19 94:6	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 $61:15$ 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17 14:1 15:1,3,13,15 17:15,22 18:17 19:4 19:11,14 20:10,14 20:17 21:6 24:12 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 26:2,13,16 27:5 28:1,8,24 29:7,18 30:2,7 31:5,18 32:3 32:6 33:5,12 34:19 35:20,22,23 36:8,14	inferred 92:6 inflow $36:18,19,21$ 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows $37:21$ influence $23:1 124:9$ 125:15 inform $12:4 15:23$ 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information $8:20$ 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20 16:25 17:1,2,5,5,6,8 17:12,14,17,19 18:1 18:6,8,9,13,13,15 19:2,5,10 20:11 21:6 22:1,4,14 24:6 24:8,9,11,22 26:16 26:20 28:20 30:21 30:23 31:5 32:5,10	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interesting 106:5,12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 13:9,11 23:12,15 72:7,8 74:18 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21 interpretation 6:14 21:15,16 22:13 27:3 54:7 56:11 66:20 73:8 77:13 82:6,9	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 join 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5 26:9 27:9,12 30:15 31:19 32:18 33:22
Hayat 19:22 head 36:10 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16 25:3,5 41:17 42:6 43:22 HEPs 22:17 35:24 41:10 43:13,18,19	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7 idea 31:19 94:6 109:24 identified 20:3 28:5	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{inclination 3:5} \\ \textbf{include } 24:14 \ 61:15 \\ 63:16 \ 102:6 \ 105:16 \\ 106:23 \ 116:10 \\ \textbf{included } 69:12 \ 89:6 \\ 107:23 \\ \textbf{includes } 75:22 \ 87:6 \\ \textbf{includes } 75:22 \ 87:6 \\ \textbf{including } 10:21 \ 18:19 \\ 34:25 \ 47:1,16 \ 65:16 \\ \textbf{incompatible } 83:4 \\ \textbf{increased } 41:11 \\ \textbf{increases } 105:10 \\ \textbf{indeed } 3:14 \ 5:2 \ 11:12 \\ 21:20 \ 25:8 \ 29:21 \\ 33:10 \ 41:1 \ 58:1 \\ \textbf{India } 1:18 \ 2:17 \ 9:5,17 \\ 14:1 \ 15:1,3,13,15 \\ 17:15,22 \ 18:17 \ 19:4 \\ 19:11,14 \ 20:10,14 \\ 20:17 \ 21:6 \ 24:12 \\ 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 \\ 26:2,13,16 \ 27:5 \\ 28:1,8,24 \ 29:7,18 \\ 30:2,7 \ 31:5,18 \ 32:3 \\ 32:6 \ 33:5,12 \ 34:19 \\ \end{array}$	inferred 92:6 inflow $36:18,19,21$ 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 influence $23:1 124:9$ 125:15 inform $12:4 15:23$ 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information $8:20$ 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20 16:25 17:1,2,5,5,6,8 17:12,14,17,19 18:1 18:68,9,13,13,15 19:2,5,10 20:11 21:6 22:1,4,14 24:6 24:8,9,11,22 26:16 26:20 28:20 30:21	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interfere 19:6 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interfact 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 international 23:9,11 23:12,15 72:7,8 74:18 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21 interpretation 6:14 21:15,16 22:13 27:3 54:7 56:11 66:20 73:8 77:13 82:6,9 93:11 100:20	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joue 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5 26:9 27:9,12 30:15 31:19 32:18 33:22 34:4 35:2 36:24 38:1,3,23 41:20,23
Hayat 19:22 head $36:10$ 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16 25:3,5 41:17 42:6 43:22 HEPs 22:17 35:24 41:10 43:13,18,19 45:12	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7 <u>I</u> idea 31:19 94:6 109:24 identified 20:3 28:5 28:14 30:20,22	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 $61:15$ 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17 14:1 15:1,3,13,15 17:15,22 18:17 19:4 19:11,14 20:10,14 20:17 21:6 24:12 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 26:2,13,16 27:5 28:1,8,24 29:7,18 30:2,7 31:5,18 32:3 32:6 33:5,12 34:19 35:20,22,23 36:8,14	inferred 92:6 inflow $36:18,19,21$ 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows $37:21$ influence $23:1 124:9$ 125:15 inform $12:4 15:23$ 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information $8:20$ 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20 16:25 17:1,2,5,5,6,8 17:12,14,17,19 18:1 18:6,8,9,13,13,15 19:2,5,10 20:11 21:6 22:1,4,14 24:6 24:8,9,11,22 26:16 26:20 28:20 30:21 30:23 31:5 32:5,10	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interesting 106:5,12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 13:9,11 23:12,15 72:7,8 74:18 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21 interpretation 6:14 21:15,16 22:13 27:3 54:7 56:11 66:20 73:8 77:13 82:6,9	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joue 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5 26:9 27:9,12 30:15 31:19 32:18 33:22 34:4 35:2 36:24 38:1,3,23 41:20,23 42:20 43:16 48:11
Hayat 19:22 head $36:10$ 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16 25:3,5 41:17 42:6 43:22 HEPs 22:17 35:24 41:10 43:13,18,19 45:12 her 1:22 25:17 42:7	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7 <u>I</u> idea 31:19 94:6 109:24 identified 20:3 28:5 28:14 30:20,22 38:25 52:19 66:8	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 $61:15$ 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 include 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17 14:1 15:1,3,13,15 17:15,22 18:17 19:4 19:11,14 20:10,14 20:17 21:6 24:12 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 26:2,13,16 27:5 28:1,8,24 29:7,18 30:2,7 31:5,18 32:3 32:6 33:5,12 34:19 35:20,22,23 36:8,14 36:20 37:17 39:10	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{inferred } 92:6\\ \textbf{inflow } 36:18,19,21\\ 39:15 \ 76:25 \ 88:19\\ 90:12 \ 95:15 \ 99:20\\ 100:9 \ 101:23\\ 110:13\\ \textbf{inflows } 37:21\\ \textbf{influence } 23:1 \ 124:9\\ 125:15\\ \textbf{inform } 12:4 \ 15:23\\ 16:17 \ 20:19 \ 22:13\\ 33:8 \ 59:9 \ 71:8\\ 114:9\\ \textbf{information } 8:20\\ 10:17 \ 11:3 \ 13:9,11\\ 13:23 \ 14:4,7,10,13\\ 14:15,23 \ 15:8,9,14\\ 15:15,19 \ 16:9,15,20\\ 16:25 \ 17:1,2,5,5,6,8\\ 17:12,14,17,19 \ 18:1\\ 18:6,8,9,13,13,15\\ 19:2,5,10 \ 20:11\\ 21:6 \ 22:1,4,14 \ 24:6\\ 24:8,9,11,22 \ 26:16\\ 26:20 \ 28:20 \ 30:21\\ 30:23 \ 31:5 \ 32:5,10\\ 33:11,12,14,15,20\\ \end{array}$	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interfere 19:6 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interfact 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 international 23:9,11 23:12,15 72:7,8 74:18 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21 interpretation 6:14 21:15,16 22:13 27:3 54:7 56:11 66:20 73:8 77:13 82:6,9 93:11 100:20	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joue 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5 26:9 27:9,12 30:15 31:19 32:18 33:22 34:4 35:2 36:24 38:1,3,23 41:20,23 42:20 43:16 48:11 49:3,18 51:15,22
Hayat 19:22 head $36:10$ 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16 25:3,5 41:17 42:6 43:22 HEPs 22:17 35:24 41:10 43:13,18,19 45:12 her 1:22 25:17 42:7 44:18	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7 <u>I</u> idea 31:19 94:6 109:24 identified 20:3 28:5 28:14 30:20,22 38:25 52:19 66:8 102:10 108:1	$\label{eq:spectral_setup} \begin{array}{l} \textbf{inclination 3:5} \\ \textbf{include } 24:14 \ 61:15 \\ 63:16 \ 102:6 \ 105:16 \\ 106:23 \ 116:10 \\ \textbf{included } 69:12 \ 89:6 \\ 107:23 \\ \textbf{includes } 75:22 \ 87:6 \\ \textbf{including } 10:21 \ 18:19 \\ 34:25 \ 47:1,16 \ 65:16 \\ \textbf{incompatible } 83:4 \\ \textbf{increased } 41:11 \\ \textbf{increases } 105:10 \\ \textbf{indeed } 3:14 \ 5:2 \ 11:12 \\ 21:20 \ 25:8 \ 29:21 \\ 33:10 \ 41:1 \ 58:1 \\ \textbf{India } 1:18 \ 2:17 \ 9:5,17 \\ 14:1 \ 15:1,3,13,15 \\ 17:15,22 \ 18:17 \ 19:4 \\ 19:11,14 \ 20:10,14 \\ 20:17 \ 21:6 \ 24:12 \\ 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 \\ 26:2,13,16 \ 27:5 \\ 28:1,8,24 \ 29:7,18 \\ 30:2,7 \ 31:5,18 \ 32:3 \\ 32:6 \ 33:5,12 \ 34:19 \\ 35:20,22,23 \ 36:8,14 \\ 36:20 \ 37:17 \ 39:10 \\ 39:13,18 \ 40:9,10,17 \\ 40:24 \ 41:1,12 \ 42:14 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{inferred } 92:6\\ \textbf{inflow } 36:18,19,21\\ 39:15 \ 76:25 \ 88:19\\ 90:12 \ 95:15 \ 99:20\\ 100:9 \ 101:23\\ 110:13\\ \textbf{inflows } 37:21\\ \textbf{influence } 23:1 \ 124:9\\ 125:15\\ \textbf{inform } 12:4 \ 15:23\\ 16:17 \ 20:19 \ 22:13\\ 33:8 \ 59:9 \ 71:8\\ 114:9\\ \textbf{information } 8:20\\ 10:17 \ 11:3 \ 13:9,11\\ 13:23 \ 14:4,7,10,13\\ 14:15,23 \ 15:8,9,14\\ 15:15,19 \ 16:9,15,20\\ 16:25 \ 17:1,2,5,5,6,8\\ 17:12,14,17,19 \ 18:1\\ 18:6,8,9,13,13,15\\ 19:2,5,10 \ 20:11\\ 21:6 \ 22:1,4,14 \ 24:6\\ 24:8,9,11,22 \ 26:16\\ 26:20 \ 28:20 \ 30:21\\ 30:23 \ 31:5 \ 32:5,10\\ 33:11,12,14,15,20\\ 37:16 \ 39:9,12,18\\ 51:24 \ 59:8 \ 62:11\\ \end{array}$	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interfere 19:6 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 international 23:9,11 23:12,15 72:7,8 74:18 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21 interpretation 6:14 21:15,16 22:13 27:3 54:7 56:11 66:20 73:8 77:13 82:6,9 93:11 100:20 interpretations 59:2 interpreted 59:16	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joue 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5 26:9 27:9,12 30:15 31:19 32:18 33:22 34:4 35:2 36:24 38:1,3,23 41:20,23 42:20 43:16 48:11 49:3,18 51:15,22 53:16,20 54:24 55:7
Hayat 19:22 head $36:10$ 74:4,5,7 74:13 77:18 122:24 124:20 headed 11:9 hear 27:20 48:19,21 49:14 heard 27:25 32:4,9 49:11 54:16 hearing 1:7 1:4,21 2:9 4:11 17:16 46:15 49:23 128:15 heavily 92:16 helpful 5:2 6:8 34:10 46:3,25 48:19 50:3 50:5 51:8 52:25 53:12 55:18,22 57:21,24 117:9 119:9 127:22 128:8 helping 117:7 HEP 9:5,6 15:1,2 19:8 19:18,24,25 20:16 25:3,5 41:17 42:6 43:22 HEPs 22:17 35:24 41:10 43:13,18,19 45:12 her 1:22 25:17 42:7	hydroengineering 84:17 hydrographs 64:22 hydrologic 14:11 18:10 90:22 97:13 103:3 hydrological 84:19 88:21 90:20 92:19 92:21 94:9 97:6 106:4 hydrology 10:6 37:20 37:24 55:4 72:18 87:23 91:7 101:16 hydropower 59:17 60:5,14 62:6 65:20 69:24 71:17 73:7,25 77:2 83:18 84:5,9 111:15,23 112:8 hydro-electric 73:13 hypothetical 57:4 H.E 2:7 <u>I</u> idea 31:19 94:6 109:24 identified 20:3 28:5 28:14 30:20,22 38:25 52:19 66:8	inclination 3:5 include 24:14 $61:15$ 63:16 102:6 105:16 106:23 116:10 included 69:12 89:6 107:23 includes 75:22 87:6 including 10:21 18:19 34:25 47:1,16 65:16 incompatible 83:4 increased 41:11 increases 105:10 indeed 3:14 5:2 11:12 21:20 25:8 29:21 33:10 41:1 58:1 India 1:18 2:17 9:5,17 14:1 15:1,3,13,15 17:15,22 18:17 19:4 19:11,14 20:10,14 20:17 21:6 24:12 25:4,9,10,14,18,25 26:2,13,16 27:5 28:1,8,24 29:7,18 30:2,7 31:5,18 32:3 32:6 33:5,12 34:19 35:20,22,23 36:8,14 36:20 37:17 39:10 39:13,18 40:9,10,17	inferred 92:6 inflow 36:18,19,21 39:15 76:25 88:19 90:12 95:15 99:20 100:9 101:23 110:13 inflows 37:21 influence 23:1 124:9 125:15 inform 12:4 15:23 16:17 20:19 22:13 33:8 59:9 71:8 114:9 information 8:20 10:17 11:3 13:9,11 13:23 14:4,7,10,13 14:15,23 15:8,9,14 15:15,19 16:9,15,20 16:25 17:1,2,5,5,6,8 17:12,14,17,19 18:1 18:6,8,9,13,13,15 19:2,5,10 20:11 21:6 22:1,4,14 24:6 24:8,9,11,22 26:16 26:20 28:20 30:21 30:23 31:5 32:5,10 33:11,12,14,15,20 37:16 39:9,12,18	intensive 107:5 intent 28:19 inter 10:16 52:5 interact 64:5 interaction 26:10 interacts 64:2 interchangeable 68:21 71:7 interchangeably 75:3 75:12,16 interest 3:6 70:2 interested 75:24 127:6 interesting 125:23 interestingly 106:5,12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 interference 11:24 12:7,9,12,24 16:12 intermational 23:9,11 23:12,15 72:7,8 74:18 interpret 63:18 85:14 85:21 interpretation 6:14 21:15,16 22:13 27:3 54:7 56:11 66:20 73:8 77:13 82:6,9 93:11 100:20 interpretations 59:2	74:9 121:11 IX 1:1 52:1 J 2:15 JAMAL 2:9 January 39:4,17 JEFFREY 1:11 Jhelum 29:2 join 18:22 joue 72:10,10 JUDGE 1:10 judgment 23:16 24:1 judicata 6:1 53:5,8 July 1:6 1:1 38:22 June 40:1 just 1:20 2:2 3:1 4:5 7:6,10 8:11,23 10:9 10:12 11:1,17 13:3 13:15 14:19 16:23 17:24 19:13 21:11 21:16 22:10 23:5 26:9 27:9,12 30:15 31:19 32:18 33:22 34:4 35:2 36:24 38:1,3,23 41:20,23 42:20 43:16 48:11 49:3,18 51:15,22

l					T
76:22 77:10,22	43:13	9:23 37:14,22 38:12	looks 37:7 95:6	material 12:23	96:7 113:17
78:18 80:1 81:2	last 6:6 8:13 9:24	38:18 39:2 41:24,24	loops 97:2	materially 12:1 19:6	meant 119:4
82:5,13 84:23 86:9	12:11 30:5 32:4	41:25,25 42:1,1,2,2	lot 105:18,18 109:17	materials 1:9	measured 72:7
91:17 95:10 96:13	33:19 39:18 44:3	46:6 51:15,16 52:21	117:21 125:25	mathematics 110:6	mechanisms 52:1
104:21 105:3 111:4	46:16 50:20 55:16	52:23 54:17 57:22	126:23 128:8	matter 1:1 12:24 23:9	meet 25:13 104:2
112:5,6 113:17,22	60:2,10 71:5 112:20	60:19,24 61:3,6,8	lots 6:24 8:1	40:13 43:10 50:18	meeting 44:4,16 50:15
114:17 117:23	120:18 124:2	61:20 71:14 89:18	low 60:25 68:11 84:14	51:25 57:22 73:5	meetings 43:15 44:2
118:17,22 123:7	late 20:23	95:12,14 100:9	85:17 88:22 96:6,10	79:15,16 93:8	meets 36:19
125:3,4 127:21	later 23:3 49:5 55:23	103:15 104:12	97:7 112:8,11 123:5	112:22	Megan 2:14 36:24
Justice 2:4 23:15	79:4 81:8 89:2	114:16	lower 60:19,24 61:20	matters 1:15 2:14	megawatt 119:1
Justin 69:16,18 71:1	112:12	lines 9:12 21:14 34:23	97:3,3 101:6 105:11	46:10 55:19 57:12	megawatts 64:13 79:2
71:13 106:11	latitude 29:7 127:19	42:2,3 95:17 100:8	lowest 84:15 105:8	113:8	85:7
	launch 1:15	line-up 128:1	120:24	maximising 45:12	MEHAR 2:5
K	LAURA 2:13	linkage 16:10,18	low-flow 65:7,14	maximum 58:22 59:15	members 2:17 5:5
Karimabad 40:4	law 2:4 7:14 23:9,11	linked 18:16 93:10	66:15,22	63:20 69:7 80:11	7:22 8:3 19:21 23:4
KC 2:10,12	23:12 47:25	Lisa 1:23	low-level 30:9	90:19 94:18 99:11	25:6 26:24 27:4,10
keep 35:22 64:12	lay 77:19	list 41:22	low-use 111:16	101:12,14,17	41:3 44:25 45:21
70:13 75:6 76:13	lead 25:15 80:10	literature 83:1	lunch 7:2	105:19 106:1	46:24 47:18 58:19
81:14 111:21	least 2:25 3:19 9:24	little 3:8 4:17 5:7,17		110:21 113:11	memorial 13:19 65:25
keeps 44:23	14:1,8 17:3 29:5	6:25 7:24 8:11	M	118:1 126:7	79:23 82:10 87:12
kept 111:25 127:4	94:11 105:8	16:22 27:22 31:15	macros 94:22 98:1	may 1:7 4:2 5:2 6:8,18	87:19 89:4,6 92:11
key 35:5 62:7 100:11	leave 34:4,5,7	32:13,25 34:16 38:2	made 22:7 40:16	6:25 12:3 14:17	106:15 108:6 110:9
121:19,23,24	left 12:24 65:21 74:11	48:19 49:25 50:4	50:17 53:21 54:11	15:22 16:4 17:9	111:6 116:20
KHAN 2:6	104:14	65:15 77:23 79:11	56:24 65:8 87:15	20:24 21:25 25:24	memory 44:5
KHEP 34:21 35:2,21	left-hand 103:17	100:6 109:11 116:5	88:6 100:10 102:21	27:23 28:25 29:9,19	mention 75:8
36:6 39:1	legal 2:6,21,21 73:8	125:6 127:17	103:8 104:8 114:13	29:23 30:15 31:12	mentioned 28:12 98:9
kicks 19:19 20:20	111:13	live 111:10	118:6 123:16,21	31:16,22,24,25	117:22 120:18
kilogram 74:17	leitmotif 11:11	LLP 2:12,13,13,14	magnitude 12:5 15:24	32:25 33:7,10,18	mentioning 76:23
kind 15:8 18:2 30:13	length 7:6 42:5	load 55:1,7 70:5,6,23	16:4,17 33:8 36:19	36:22 46:6,9,11,14	mentions 76:7
31:16 53:3 117:22	less 5:7 36:20 39:2,15	70:24 94:2 103:12	main 59:4 93:21	47:8 48:3,7,25 49:1	mere 20:21
KING 2:21	66:2,5 86:12 95:16	103:14,22,24 104:2	mainly 59:11 61:17	49:23 50:3 51:7,11	merely 84:13
Kingdom 2:8,9,10	96:9 99:25 101:8	104:17,22,24 105:4	maintain 10:20	51:25 54:15 56:2,3	merit 51:4
Kiru 65:19 85:18	104:7 124:5 125:6	105:7,9,14 106:6,8	126:19	56:13 57:21 59:3,9	Merits 1:7
86:11	let 9:25 34:23 35:16	109:20 110:23	major 93:3	63:20,22 65:10 73:8	met 22:4 91:11
Kishenganga 4:15	37:11 48:8 50:1	111:9 123:13,15,19	make 3:9 5:16 7:2 8:2	79:14 84:24 93:17	method 84:24 90:23
24:4 27:1,6 28:21	53:18,19 54:1	123:22 124:7,8,10	8:21 14:24 16:22	94:3 96:10 107:10	98:2,11 99:1,16
34:20 35:6,25 36:12	108:12 113:25	124:24 125:5,14,15	17:8 19:3 24:8,23	113:2 119:4	101:11 105:17
38:7,15,20 39:15,21	letter 15:20	125:19 126:4	48:7 53:24 55:7	maybe 23:24 30:15	106:13 109:13,16
39:22 40:12,17,19	let's 29:4 54:2 89:3	loading 96:15 123:13	57:16 76:4 81:9	32:18 127:17	109:24 110:4,15,17
44:23 53:3 54:9	116:24 117:15	123:25 124:12	88:10 93:6 98:3	MC 127:20	methodology 54:19
56:18,20 57:5	level 36:7 86:1 97:17	loads 112:10	100:15,20 105:2	McGowan 1:23	86:6 90:25 91:3,5
Kishenganga-Neelum	97:18 111:25	locate 18:9 103:23	107:6,8 111:5 113:4	Mead 122:16,16	91:19 94:8 103:22
29:1 37:13	120:24 122:17,19	104:10	114:17 115:2,20	mean 19:20 31:25	105:16 106:9
know 8:7 31:11 34:2	122:21,22,23	located 37:25 77:17	121:19 122:4	48:21 56:2 57:7	112:25 116:7,8
48:19 50:10 55:25	levelled 81:13	locating 104:16	123:18 125:16,19	65:4,19 66:2,4,16	methods 89:7 93:4
56:2 59:20 104:25	lies 30:20	location 14:11 17:13	127:17	67:15,19,23 68:3,5	107:12
109:10 113:5,25	life 116:23	17:17 18:8,13 24:14	makes 12:17 18:7	73:16 75:7,12 76:8	metre 74:17
115:12 117:7,14	lifecycles 111:10	28:9 30:8,23 31:20	63:20,21 68:18	76:9,13,16,17,21	metres 76:18 81:16
121:5 123:2	light 20:23 29:15	77:14 98:19 99:9,15	79:18	77:4,6 80:5,10 81:7	120:25 126:13
knowing 18:12 80:23	83:23	logic 80:15	making 43:21 72:15	81:14 82:3,8 84:16	metric 72:9
80:25 88:1 100:19	like 6:15 21:4 23:5	London 2:10,11,11,12	82:5 92:10 100:11	85:13,24 86:1,13,18	metric-cubed 117:23
known 32:11 74:1,5	27:13 29:25 37:7	2:12,13,13,14	114:2	88:2,5 89:21 90:8	microphone 3:6 48:4
106:9	68:23 72:16 87:18	long 41:22 56:18	Malik's 19:22	94:11 95:2,19 96:9	middle 50:12 89:18
knows 31:25	88:9 95:6 113:5	123:4 Jongon 5:7 7:1 41:6	management 5:19	101:5,25 105:20	111:17 midst 20:5
	116:13 117:21 118:5 127:15	longer 5:7 7:1 41:6	44:22	118:18 119:3,4,8	midst 30:5 mid-afternoon 3:1
L		109:19 look 31:9 73:10 78:11	Manager 2:22	121:6 monning 12:22 27:15	48:1
L 2:14	likely 2:25 6:24 16:12 47:2 49:5	80:19 89:3 94:13	manner 47:7	meaning 12:22 27:15 59:23 60:7 71:8	48:1 might 17:22 30:7 34:1
lack 108:3	47:2 49:5 limit 99:25		manufacture 25:19	82:14 83:23 84:1,4	34:3 46:7 49:15
Lafitte's 54:13	limited 37:16 61:19	98:11 99:24 111:22 119:10 122:10	many 9:16 45:16,16	84:9,21,23 85:11	50:2 51:2 53:5 54:8
lag 60:22 61:7 64:25	63:23 68:11 86:17	123:16,21	62:6 82:21 95:8,8	120:9 123:10,10	80:2 81:9 87:17
laid 3:3	limits 34:14 99:11,12	looked 11:8 87:13	128:6	meaningful 8:21	91:23 92:1 106:21
lake 122:16,16,19	99:14 102:20 115:7	125:24	man-made 12:14	14:24 19:3 24:8	113:4,20 117:21
language 15:14 19:16	115:9	looking 28:25 29:1	map 17:12	meanings 62:22	118:5,7 127:10
33:4 89:1 107:9	line 1:25 2:1 8:24,25	62:18 67:25 68:1	March 39:3	means 12:12 21:21	Miles 2:11 5:16 6:20
117:17	8:25 9:1,1,1,2,2,9	74:9 93:21 95:10	margin 61:23 67:17	22:1 57:17 63:14	54:17 58:23 59:1,11
large 42:15 43:3 80:9	9:10,10,11,11,11,12	100:19 104:3	marginal 61:13,14	73:13 76:24 77:5	60:2 61:12 72:14
96:14 106:1 122:13	9:13,13,14,14,15,23	113:12 124:3,4,5,17	70:15,19	82:21 84:15 85:11	73:9,20 81:18 85:4
largely 5:13 10:5	7.10,10,17,17,10,20	113.12 127.3,7,3,17	mass 73:21 78:9 79:15	02.21 01.15 05.11	75.7,20 01.10 05.4
	1			1	

	-				
89:1 93:11 107:10	16:23,25 17:9 26:4	navigation 112:2	notified 47:1	occurs 65:3	operator 65:11 113:23
117:13	26:14 28:7 30:6	near 53:1	notify 12:1 13:8 15:21	October 39:3,4 40:3	114:6,14,23 115:20
Miles's 6:22	31:15,17 33:13	necessarily 16:19	noting 44:10	odds 87:7	124:13 126:14
		e e	notion 11:10		
mills 23:16,20 24:1	35:17 41:1 42:14	25:15 28:7 76:25		off 3:22 41:13 95:13	opinion 11:25
mind 14:18 33:22	43:3 45:9,9 49:5,25	necessary 47:8 74:16	notional 1:11	111:12 113:19	opportunity 9:19
49:19 64:12 70:13	50:4 53:16 54:23	necessity 25:20	November 38:14,22	117:13 119:10	14:16 15:4 22:16
74:24 76:14 81:14	62:1,5 65:10,15	need 1:15 6:10 17:19	40:6	124:20	26:4 48:3 96:16
108:16 111:22	67:25 70:20 71:2	30:8,11 34:3 35:7	number 2:6 3:15,18	offered 91:22	109:13
120:19	79:11 95:11,16 99:1	36:16 55:3 56:10,22	4:9 5:17 6:7 8:4 9:9	Office 2:7	opposed 32:15 119:2
mindful 29:7	102:10 107:19	57:1 102:11 104:19	10:2 11:17 13:14	official 33:2	120:20
minds 8:15 48:22	109:17 112:11	104:23 107:5	24:25 28:18 37:2	off-the-shelf 43:14	optimisation 63:11
Minear 1:11 77:9,10	118:6 119:6 121:16	114:19 123:22	39:6,7,20 47:21	44:1	optimise 61:14
77:21 79:14,25 80:1	122:22 126:5	127:23	86:3 88:3 90:9	often 24:17 68:20	optimum 64:10
80:8 91:13,14,22	morning 7:25 49:2,6	needed 93:18	94:20 96:14 101:23	75:15	104:10
108:13 111:3,4	111:11 127:12,21	needing 6:17 78:23	105:24 109:7	Oh 31:19	options 87:17 94:3
112:4,18 113:3,17	Morris 2:14 5:9,11,16	needs 30:2,13 32:3	113:13,14 117:5	Ohio 112:1	107:4
114:17,23 115:2,11	5:21 49:4,11,14,20	55:21 124:13	118:1 124:20	okay 1:3 37:9 76:2	opts 65:11
115:22	60:1 127:9,14	Neelum 38:1,2,4,6,12	numerous 40:15	77:8 83:11 91:16	oral 13:18 50:17 53:23
minimum 24:11,14,21	most 13:24 49:12	60:4,18	numerous 40.15	92:3 109:2 111:2	orally 3:17
		Neelum-Jhelum 60:5	0		2
35:13 36:11,15	78:16 81:23 90:24			115:22 117:12	orange 95:12 100:25
40:11,18 60:25 61:3	92:16 106:12	64:23 85:18 86:22	object 21:17 22:10	125:1 126:6 127:3,7	103:15,19
65:4 66:2,4,16	125:14	negative 95:22,24	objection 17:8	once 9:7 22:22 73:17	order 21:1 59:7 64:21
67:15,19 68:5 70:4	motion 29:19	96:4 97:24 102:24	objections 14:17	74:9 88:7 91:10	104:18,23 117:3
73:16 76:8,13,16,17	motivation 41:16 45:1	Netherlands 1:5 2:8,9	21:10	96:1 112:24 115:19	127:16
76:21 77:4,6 80:5	motivations 41:19	2:10	objective 87:15 105:1	one 1:20 3:10 8:10	ordered 36:12
80:10 81:7,14 82:3	mouse 95:11	Neutral 7:5 47:4,17	objectives 16:21	28:7 29:16 30:6,23	ordinary 83:23 84:9
82:8 84:16 85:13,24	move 55:19 71:10	50:3,7,11,15,24	obligation 8:19 9:5,6	38:1,3 42:12 43:12	organisation 47:13
86:1,13,18 88:2,4	85:16 94:15	51:1,2,6,10,19 52:3	9:18 13:8 14:22	47:15 51:16,21,25	organised 52:17
89:21 90:8 94:11	moved 20:20 29:18	52:7,10,14,16,25	15:1,3,4,12,18,18	53:5 58:5 69:3,9	orifice 36:7 44:24
95:2,19 96:9 99:11	31:19 104:21	53:4,10,15 55:10,12	18:1 19:1,19 20:19	72:2 76:3 89:25	original 104:20
101:5,25 105:20	movement 60:22	55:18,25 56:6,21	25:4,9,10,24 26:3	94:15 95:9 96:22	115:18
118:18 119:3,4,8	moving 27:8 63:25	87:14 92:23 93:5	26:11,12,19 27:16	98:17 100:23	other 2:5 4:24 5:1
120:10 121:6	113:3	99:17 100:10	27:25	107:15 108:18	10:22 12:1,2,4
122:21 125:13	much 5:6 11:10 41:6	116:21	obligations 21:19 22:3	109:4 111:21 113:8	14:13 15:21,23 16:3
minimums 60:17	56:10 57:25 58:9	never 97:23	23:7,8,18,23 25:11	113:18 114:7	16:17 18:13,15
Minister 35:4	60:12 68:12 70:17	new 37:2	25:16,21,23 26:1	116:13 117:9,19	21:23 22:3,5 24:20
Ministry 2:4,5,6 2:8	79:13,24 108:11	next 7:21 32:23 33:13	40:12 44:14 45:3	118:4,19 119:17	28:20 31:2,8 33:7
7:16 33:1	109:11,12 127:1,3,8	71:11 73:3,14 94:16		123:4 126:10	33:21 36:17 37:4
minutes 5:6 6:11,17	128:9,12	94:24 107:16	obligation[s 25:5	ones 124:15	46:10 47:21 51:25
6:23 48:6 58:7 90:5	MUHAMMAD 2:5	124:23	obliged 20:10	one-shot 33:12	53:17 55:19 56:13
117:24 127:4	multiply 78:22 117:24	nobody 66:3	obliterate 17:25	only 8:7 17:17 18:2	70:7,10 73:20 74:3
Mississippi 112:1	MURPHY 1:10	noise 42:24	obliterated 18:4	35:18 37:16 39:15	74:15 80:8 89:25
MMD 78:8,22 117:23	Murtaza 7:16	nominally 100:4	observation 37:25	40:25 42:12 54:18	92:4 100:1 105:21
117:24 121:16	must 8:20 14:7,23	none 79:18 108:2	42:13 79:23 88:6	58:1 59:10 63:20	105:21,22 106:17
mobilisation 22:19	15:8,10 16:9,20	non-substantive 16:7	104:20 118:19	68:7,25 74:3 80:9	106:20 109:22
modern 72:9		norm 85:12	123:17		
	17:1,3,5,6 18:11,16		observations 4:1 7:3	81:24 86:19 88:12	117:1,9 121:24
Modi 35:4	19:2,11,14 22:12	normal 58:1 85:11	7:18 10:1 25:1,18	93:9,13 94:2,6,15	124:1
moment 4:5 10:10,13	24:11,13 29:7 30:21	120:20,22 123:10	26:9 45:22 53:20	94:19 110:10 121:2	otherwise 5:11 18:12
11:22 12:20 13:4,15	31:5,6 33:2 60:21	127:5	105:16 117:10	123:15,21	out 1:24 29:8,19 37:9
16:23 33:18,19	75:21 83:18 98:17	northern 124:3,18	observe 45:3,14 86:12	open 35:22	38:8 56:2,3 68:23
42:20 54:2 55:9	99:11 111:25	notably 5:18 7:23	116:9	opening 3:1 1:16 2:16	77:19 78:14,16,19
86:9 120:14	MUSTANSAR 2:7	21:18 23:12 37:3	observed 19:25 43:10	2:20 4:8,21 47:19	81:13,22 82:2 88:9
momentarily 53:16	mutual 47:11 50:22	52:15	44:20	50:10	93:19 101:3 105:13
moments 64:15	MW 124:4,19,22	note 10:25 15:7,17	observes 67:16	openly 56:9	107:21 110:8
Monday 1:6 1:1 14:5	myself 42:12 58:24	23:4,6,24 24:1	obstruction 12:14	operate 86:3 90:9	118:17 121:3
21:5 100:24 101:1		26:25 34:13 40:13	obtain 21:1	112:2 113:13,24	outcome 86:7,19
101:10 113:15	N	42:4,22 43:16 46:6	obtained 61:16 62:11	115:14,15 126:17	87:23 102:1 122:9
monitor 37:15,21	NAEEM 2:4	48:1 49:4 50:20	89:19	operated 114:5,7	outflow 89:14 99:21
monitoring 35:19	namely 45:17	57:21 65:6 68:2	obviously 3:6 29:3	operates 113:8,18	outlet 30:9,12
38:17	Narendra 35:4	72:17 89:10 92:19	49:9 50:18 76:5	operating 85:23 90:14	outlets 6:13
monthly 109:3	narrow 30:16 100:25	93:6 96:13 105:6	81:7 110:2 111:12	101:4 102:2 111:14	outliers 97:10
months 9:20 14:1,8	NASIR 2:9	noted 3:17 41:9	124:12	112:7 113:9,21	output 62:7
15:5 17:3,19 18:2	natural 73:22 87:23	117:19	occasion 30:6	114:14,24 120:12	outputs 100:23
21:11 26:5,7,14	88:19 89:13 95:14	notes 108:10	occasions 39:16,20	121:10,10	outside 42:25
27:18 54:4 102:17	119:25 121:2	nothing 63:23 78:8	40:15	operation 44:12	over 1:19 7:20 10:12
120:2		notification 8:21	occur 66:16	100:25	11:17 36:10 39:16
more 4:24 5:17 9:16	nature 12:4 15:24	12:18 14:24 16:14		operational 38:14,15	40:25 51:23 62:7
9:19 13:10 15:5,12	16:4,17 33:8 54:4	16:19 19:3	occurrence 65:17	99:5 111:19	72:2 73:1 81:12
,, 10.10 10.0,12	55:14		92:18	////	, 2.2 , 3.1 01.12
		1			

83:3 85:17 89:19	22:24 24:4,10,24	past 58:1 127:4	pink 66:3,23	120:22 122:20	87:12 92:11
92:25 100:6 102:18	25:22 26:6 32:25	pause 27:9 43:1,16	place 50:16 54:9 65:12	124:1	prepare 48:20 109:11
108:25 109:19	37:18 40:8 44:17	56:16	86:20 104:10,24	points 2:5 3:25 6:7	prepared 58:3 106:10
110:11,14 116:8	50:13 51:13,21 52:2	PCA 1:3 50:8	placed 44:11 46:19	8:10,15 20:14 28:13	108:10
118:13 119:5 120:2	52:5,11,12 54:7	PCIW 39:23 40:5,6,14	places 3:24	40:11 42:13 46:17	preselect 86:6
122:17 124:18	63:3,14,16,18,19,19	41:2	placing 104:18	49:18,25 64:17	present 10:8 13:23
122:17 124:18	63:21 64:8 70:3	Peace 1:4	plain 12:22 54:11	119:16	80:14 90:23 92:25
overall 59:6 70:16,18	73:5 83:17 85:9	peak 70:5 101:13	plainly 36:3	policies 120:12	108:20 120:14
99:7 104:2 126:12	88:13 90:5 93:7,8	112:12 124:14	plan 20:15 24:12	policy 31:25 32:1 45:8	presentation 4:8,10
126:17	93:25 94:1,7 98:12	peaking 62:2,4 90:6	26:20	121:10	5:10,11 6:16 19:22
overarching 10:1	98:12,13 99:3,4,6	94:5 107:21 123:22	planned 5:23 42:16	political 32:2	49:4 59:13 60:9
overly 34:17	99:24 100:13,16	124:6.13	43:5 56:14 77:16	pool 119:24	69:23 70:14 71:5
overriding 25:10 99:8	102:2,5,8,20 107:18	peaks 123:16	planning 8:18 12:25	portion 67:8 69:20	77:24 84:6 91:25
oversight 23:24	107:18,20 114:3,7	pedestrian 8:11	14:21 16:2 18:25	posed 91:24	112:20 117:16
overview 13:16	115:7 117:17 118:6	pegging 85:12	19:8 20:20,23 27:25	position 1:24 17:16	119:6,11 127:4
own 29:19 34:14	119:12,13 120:17	per 72:10 74:17 76:18	30:1 31:22 60:11	19:11,12,14,15	presentations 1:12
39:13 53:9 63:11	paragraphs 27:3	81:16 109:6 117:5	62:9 84:7,10 109:19	24:22 28:24 37:12	5:25 48:13 128:7
70:21 75:18 107:20	35:10,15 36:13 44:6	perceives 45:7	plans 3:3 11:21,22,23	40:10 51:9,10,12	presented 30:15 59:4
110:19,24,25	51:20	percentage 103:16,18	12:2,21 15:21 16:11	71:24 83:14 103:23	59:14 60:1 73:20
116:23 118:12	parallel 47:4	103:20	19:16,17 22:7 29:13	104:10,16,19 105:6	82:10 87:19 88:14
owner 20:25	parameter 82:21	perfectly 29:21	30:3 31:6	111:5,7 116:14	89:4,23 106:15
o'clock 58:3,8	122:24 123:19	perform 69:21	plant 14:3,11 17:5	121:14	108:6 116:18
0 CIUCK 30.3,0	parameters 73:22	performed 89:4 95:20	24:15 28:21 38:7,15	positions 87:13	125:24 127:11
P	paraphrasing 51:23	perhaps 1:15,18 4:23	39:15,21 44:8 51:25	possibilities 30:18	presenting 43:12
	paraphrasing 51:25 parcel 54:12	23:24 27:21 29:24	62:8 63:10,22,24	45:14	98:23
P 1:11	parcel 54:12 parking 53:16	30:20 36:24 49:5,13	69:22,24,25 70:1,12	45:14 possibility 1:7 35:22	98:23 press 28:19 56:23
page 1:25 2:1 8:24,25	parlance 24:18 71:7	49:14 53:14,18	70:20,21,25 71:20	49:21	presume 42:24 50:25
8:25,25 9:1,1,2,2,9	84:17	66:17 91:14,21	74:6 76:6,9,10,11	possible 1:7 46:21	prevalence 85:17
9:10,10,10,11,11,12	part 7:8 13:21 18:8	119:7 121:14	76:22,23 77:1,11,14	48:24 62:2 71:15	previous 63:4 70:13
9:12,13,13,13,14,14	31:22 45:2 46:22	period 39:2,17 40:4	77:15 78:21 86:3	94:14 102:12,18	84:6 100:22 101:3
9:23,23 12:22 21:14	47:23 66:13 68:12	60:9 67:20 72:2	90:9,14,15 99:15	103:8 111:21	102:10 103:4
34:23 37:1 41:24,24	69:19,23 70:2 76:14	73:2 81:6,23 82:23	104:1,4 105:6,10,11	posted 50:8	108:17
41:25,25 42:1,1,1,2	78:16 90:15 97:3	83:3 85:1,18 91:1	111:15 112:8 113:8	potential 23:13 29:3	previously 11:8 42:22
42:2,3 69:18	107:24 112:19	92:6 96:3,22 98:14	113:9,13,18,21,24	41:10 63:2 82:6	43:2 84:23 87:13
Pakistan 1:16 2:2,7,9	117:6 119:11	98:15 99:8 100:4,24	114:4,4,25 115:21	88:23 103:3,7	43.2 84.23 87.13 99:2
2:9 3:2 1:5 2:21	120:17	101:1 102:8,12	116:14 120:7	110:13	pre-construction 20:2
9:18 14:3,16 15:4	partial 4:23 24:4 27:6	109:7,19 114:19	121:16 122:6,7,20	PO6 6:9 47:12 50:21	pre-feasibility 20:5,12
17:7,15,21 18:20	34:20 35:9,11,25	120:2 122:17	123:14 126:9	practical 112:7	29:10,25 31:24
19:5,7 20:10,24	45:25 46:2,20 47:2	126:15,20	plants 44:12 54:22,24	practice 19:20 47:25	primarily 59:10
21:7,10,11,12,15	50:2 53:3,7,24 54:3	periods 62:2 63:6 65:7	56:13 70:7,11 106:7	84:5 94:21	Prime 35:3
24:10,12,22 25:8	55:11 57:3,6,6,11	65:14,22 66:2,7,12	124:4,6	practices 7:14	principle 22:12 34:7
26:3,13,17 28:18,25	57:20 67:3.4	66:16,22 81:19	plant's 103:23	practising 59:16	47:14 50:21,22 51:3
29:9 30:9 31:9,18	particular 6:4 10:25	86:21 93:1 94:11,20	plan[ning 29:17	preamble 11:12,14	89:8 112:6,24
35:19 37:12,15,16	18:16 19:18 28:5,8	94:23,25 95:23,24	pleadings 54:4	21:23	principles 41:13
37:21 38:3,5,7,11	30:7,8 31:20 32:1	97:21 98:7 100:25	please 34:11 36:22,23	precedential 53:6	probably 5:6 32:17
38:12,21,25 39:14	34:2 43:11 51:24	101:8 102:18	76:4 83:12 113:25	precise 32:18 62:20,22	52:20 126:5
40:16,17 41:9,12,16	52:17 55:22 63:2	peripherally 116:11	plus 66:23 67:4,6	79:6 80:21 83:5,7	problem 110:21
42:17 43:6,12 44:19	74:7 79:18 99:23	Permanent 1:4 2:19	pm 1:2 2:19 58:11,13	83:17	procedure 76:16
45:4,7 46:2,18	101:4 113:19,20	10:13	108:14 128:14	precisely 16:9 62:14	118:17
50:12 52:9 53:21	particularly 23:11	permissible 110:21	podium 1:14 58:15	75:22 81:1 83:19	proceed 3:11 34:11
56:17 65:25 78:6	particulars 14:12	permitted 63:15	point 1:20 3:12 14:7,8	88:5	46:25 47:7 58:17
79:21 87:19 88:14	parties 10:21 11:13	person 58:5 111:14	15:7,9 17:18,19	precision 62:24 83:6,9	83:12 127:11,21
93:1 106:15 108:5	21:22 22:2,8,16,25	113:8	19:11,18 20:11,12	119:6 124:24	proceeding 50:4 52:14
116:7,14,19 117:1 Pakistani 1:22	28:16 47:1	perspective 49:8 73:7	20:13,17,20,22 21:3	precluded 25:14	115:24,24
Pakistani 1:23 Pakistan'a 1:24 7:16	partly 55:25 56:1	PER-1 22:24	23:2,25 24:12 26:8	predominant 65:2	proceedings 47:4,6,14
Pakistan's 1:24 7:16	parts 45:1 68:8,10	Peter 2:15 58:6	26:15,21,24 27:24	predominantly	50:7,23,24 51:1
7:18,19 13:16,19	71:14	phase 1:7 24:13 40:24	28:1,4 29:10,18,20	116:12	52:17 55:10,13,19
19:4 20:18 22:11	partway 95:25	phases 19:24 20:1,2,3	30:1,21 31:8,23	prefer 43:8	116:2 127:16
23:6,22 26:21 35:19	party 5:3 11:21,23	56:5	32:3,5,10,15,21	prefers 45:5	process 8:21 14:24
36:10 37:22 41:18 44:10 47:20 51:10	12:1,2,4,21,25	PHILIPPA 2:11	33:1,16 35:18 37:13	preliminary 3:12 4:22	19:3 20:20 21:3
66:20 78:1,21 83:14	15:20,21,23 16:2,3	PHM-12 42:8 44:19	45:23 46:16 53:13	22:20 45:25 46:2,8	27:25 32:20 50:12
	16:10,17 22:3,5	phrase 77:11	55:2,22,23 60:21	46:9,13,20 47:2	69:23 87:12 94:22
85:22 87:12 89:4 96:25 97:14 111:13	29:13 30:3 33:7,21	phrasing 83:4	63:1 68:23 71:12	50:2 53:24 54:3	94:24 97:17,20
96:25 97:14 111:15 Palace 1:4	73:23	physical 77:14,17	72:15 78:14 81:22	55:11 57:3,10,20	103:25 105:15
	part-load 66:7	PIC 43:15 44:2,4,16	82:2 83:14 88:9	98:25	110:6 113:20
paragraph 11:8,16	passed 24:11	pick 6:8 59:12	93:4 101:13 103:19	premise 87:20 88:16	116:17,22,22 117:4
12:8,10,20 13:1,1 13:24 14:8 16:24	passes 45:18	picking 3:16 71:12	107:10 111:8 113:3	91:4 116:25 117:1	118:4 126:3
18:14 20:19 21:17	passing 77:6	piece 69:17 74:3	114:2 118:17,23	preparation 20:6	produce 61:24 86:21
10.14 20.19 21.17	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	1			1	

produced 1:23 32:14	63:24 113:13	46:1,12 47:10,22,23	rate 60:9 61:1 63:6,6	record 8:13 24:2 37:4	40:13 64:18 70:4
70:25 81:12 82:8	provision 11:6 12:19	48:25 52:24 53:21	67:18 68:22 70:8	47:6 50:7,8,15	121:6 123:25
88:1,23 110:8	16:6,15,20 17:14	54:1,4 55:16 59:6	72:6,15,18 73:2,15	53:20 56:5 60:17	relates 76:5
produces 89:22	33:11 88:10 93:7	59:18,21 61:11	79:8 80:18,24 81:17	84:20 90:20,22	relating 5:19 10:6
-	98:9	-	-	92:17,19,21 94:9,10	
production 61:16 63:5		62:18 63:1 64:18	81:25 82:2,19,23		12:3 15:22 33:6
79:8 80:18 81:10	provisions 10:3,4 13:5	66:25 67:11 68:13	84:14,15 85:7,24	96:7 97:6,8,13	48:13 58:16 74:5
106:2	13:9,11,17,22,23	68:14 69:15 71:11	86:1,5,6,12,15	103:3 107:13	relation 37:19 54:16
Professor 1:10,12	14:18 22:14 26:19	71:22 72:3,25 74:21	87:22 88:2,5 89:13	red 61:8 89:18 100:3	68:25
2:11,12 6:12,17	52:5	74:25 78:19,20 80:2	89:14,15,17,19,21	redefined 75:7	relationship 68:15
25:17 42:4,23 43:11	public 28:20 47:5 50:7	82:4 83:13,20 84:2	90:2,7,10,16 94:25	redefinition 75:4	70:10 86:23 96:20
44:18 74:22,23	50:14 56:5,7	85:16,21,21 91:13	95:22 96:21 97:22	redistribute 110:3	121:17 122:3
75:10 76:2,19 77:8	publication 1:23 2:2	91:15,21,22,23,24	98:8 100:7,22 101:4	redistributed 89:20	relative 62:11 69:24
81:4,5 82:4,13,16	publicly 24:2 52:13	92:1 106:19 116:24	101:6 102:3 105:8	reduced 94:19	106:7
83:1,11 108:13,16	published 52:16	119:10	106:1,3 108:24	reduces 94:20 106:13	relatively 33:23 84:14
108:19,25 109:2,9	pulling 7:7	questions 3:4,5,9,10	109:7 117:3 119:2,7	110:7	release 36:15,21 40:18
109:23 110:10	pulp 23:16,20 24:1	3:11 3:5,7,8,14,16	120:3,4 121:2	reducing 122:23	90:16 126:21
111:2 123:6,7,24	purely 78:7	3:16,19 4:8,9,12,17	126:19	Rees-Evans 2:13 1:21	released 89:21 98:14
124:10 125:1,4	purpose 10:18,23		rated 61:8,9,9	refer 21:5 71:13 81:21	relevance 13:3 48:14
		5:8,18 6:4,18,21,25			
programme 56:6	14:13 16:16 17:2	7:3 8:4 9:25 14:19	rates 100:2 102:6	93:11 94:2 99:6	63:2
95:23	18:3 21:18 22:6,10	17:11 21:25 25:1	rather 21:10 34:23	107:10 120:8	relevant 3:6 10:8
progression 59:8	38:16 45:19 75:23	27:10,13 41:22 46:4	48:5 49:2 71:3 73:2	122:15 125:13	16:15 17:11 37:5
progressively 105:11	79:16 84:2 120:7	46:9,14 47:22,22	76:22 92:7 100:12	reference 2:1 9:22	47:3 50:3 58:18
prohibition 35:8	126:24	48:8,9,13 49:2,6,10	118:20 121:21	10:25 12:6 24:5	69:17 70:23 77:24
project 20:5,8,11,25	purposes 13:23 17:7	49:24 52:3,4 56:25	Ratle 56:12	28:19 63:17,21	125:6,7 126:5
24:18,20 30:25 31:2	23:5 25:19 43:22	58:16,21,23 59:4,7	Raymond 54:13	68:19 69:3,16 70:2	reliably 60:13 61:2
32:11 35:4 37:24	pursuant 1:1	59:14 62:17 74:23	reach 22:16 101:12	70:7 71:19,25 73:4	reliance 54:8
62:10,13 65:13,20	pursue 79:13	77:23 108:15	reaches 24:13 101:17	80:21 93:9 99:22	relied 55:1
86:25 112:16	push 117:12 119:10	116:21 117:10,12	react 53:18	references 3:24 8:13	reluctant 75:25
122:13,15	put 3:16 27:14 30:6	122:14	reacting 53:21	8:16,23 9:8,24	rely 92:16
projected 22:7	31:15,20 46:16	quick 65:16 109:10	read 8:12 12:8 13:2	14:20 42:9 106:12	remainder 5:22 59:12
projects 42:19 43:7	50:11 53:22 61:11	quickly 8:24 35:17	15:12 59:19 65:22	referred 1:21 36:2	81:15 90:16 101:2
1 0		1 0			
62:10 71:18 111:23	77:16 112:20	41:23 95:11 96:17	65:23 67:24 84:25	37:24 44:18 51:25	remained 46:23
111:23,24 112:1	118:13	123:7	readily 4:25 46:4	70:13 72:14,25 83:2	remaining 46:4
125:12,25 126:1	putative 17:22	quite 9:9 12:18 15:11	reading 7:19 12:17	103:25 118:20	remains 37:17
	-	-	0		
project's 61:4	puts 78:12	18:7 43:16 48:1	22:11 23:6 53:9	124:10	remarks 4:7,21 6:22
promise 9:16	putting 3:7	53:19 66:13 75:15	82:11 85:5	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12	remember 125:22
	•			124:10	-
promise 9:16	putting 3:7	53:19 66:13 75:15	82:11 85:5	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12	remember 125:22
promise 9:16 promote 10:20	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20	remember 125:22 remit 11:2
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-208 40:22	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 R	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-208 40:22 P-209 40:22	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 <u>Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21</u>	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-208 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-208 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-212 40:23	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-212 40:23 P-213 40:23	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15	 putting 3:7 p-0350 2:2,3 p-188 40:22 p-202 40:22 p-203 40:22 p-208 40:22 p-210 40:22 p-211 40:23 p-212 40:23 p-213 40:23 p-214 40:23 p-214 40:23 p-217 40:1 	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:24 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-212 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-219 40:2 P-214 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-214 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-219 40:1 P-219 40:1 P-215 44:17	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflection 103:5 reflection 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-200 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-214 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-214 40:24 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeting 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-214 40:3 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-34 44:6 P-642 37:3 40:3	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-642 37:3 40:3 P-643 40:6	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3 108:11,16,18,23 109:1,3,17 110:5,18	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeting 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-214 40:3 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-34 44:6 P-642 37:3 40:3	$53:19\ 66:13\ 75:15\\77:3\ 119:21\ 126:25\\127:5\\ \textbf{quoting}\ 51:22\\ \hline \hline \\ \hline $	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-642 37:3 40:3 P-643 40:6	$53:19\ 66:13\ 75:15\\77:3\ 119:21\ 126:25\\127:5\\ \textbf{quoting}\ 51:22\\ \hline \hline \\ \hline $	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provide 10:17 13:16	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3 108:11,16,18,23 109:1,3,17 110:5,18 111:4,21 112:13,19 113:16 114:1,22 115:1,4,12,23 116:8	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-215 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5	$53:19\ 66:13\ 75:15\\77:3\ 119:21\ 126:25\\127:5\\ \textbf{quoting}\ 51:22\\ \hline \\ $	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-219 40:2 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-642 37:3 40:3 P-644 37:3,5	$53:19\ 66:13\ 75:15\\77:3\ 119:21\ 126:25\\127:5\\ \textbf{quoting}\ 51:22\\ \hline \\ $	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflection 103:5 reflection 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requested 87:1
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5	putting 3:7 p-0350 2:2,3 p-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-212 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3 108:11,16,18,23 109:1,3,17 110:5,18 111:4,21 112:13,19 113:16 114:1,22 115:1,4,12,23 116:8 117:11,14 118:3,10 119:15,20 120:22 121:17 122:8,15	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 receive 127:25	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 regards 16:8 28:21	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requested 87:1 requests 26:17 85:17
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:13,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-200 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5 Qualitative 116:2 quality 92:22 97:14,16 quantities 69:1	$\begin{array}{c} 53:19\ 66:13\ 75:15\\ 77:3\ 119:21\ 126:25\\ 127:5\\ \textbf{quoting}\ 51:22\\ \hline \\ $	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 received 40:9 98:13	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 regards 16:8 28:21 region 32:1 60:3 124:3	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requested 87:1 requests 26:17 85:17 require 26:22 96:11
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24 60:13,17 61:2 65:24	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5	$\begin{array}{c} 53:19\ 66:13\ 75:15\\ 77:3\ 119:21\ 126:25\\ 127:5\\ \textbf{quoting}\ 51:22\\ \hline \\ $	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 receive 127:25 received 40:9 98:13 receiving 1:13	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 regards 16:8 28:21 region 32:1 60:3 124:3 124:18	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requests 26:17 85:17 require 26:22 96:11 102:6 105:18
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24 60:13,17 61:2 65:24 69:6 86:2 91:6,10	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3 108:11,16,18,23 109:1,3,17 110:5,18 111:4,21 112:13,19 113:16 114:1,22 115:1,4,12,23 116:8 117:11,14 118:3,10 119:15,20 120:22 121:17 122:8,15 123:7,15 124:1,15 125:2,10 126:11 127:7,8	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 receive 127:25 received 40:9 98:13 receiving 1:13 recent 36:1 40:14	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 regards 16:8 28:21 region 32:1 60:3 124:3 124:18 regret 95:11	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repet 4:3 77:10 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 request 87:1 request 87:1 request 26:17 85:17 require 26:22 96:11 102:6 105:18 107:12,19
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24 60:13,17 61:2 65:24 69:6 86:2 91:6,10 106:13	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-642 37:3 40:3 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3 108:11,16,18,23 109:1,3,17 110:5,18 111:4,21 112:13,19 113:16 114:1,22 115:1,4,12,23 116:8 117:11,14 118:3,10 119:15,20 120:22 121:17 122:8,15 123:7,15 124:1,15 125:2,10 126:11 127:7,8 Rae's 5:10 6:21	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 receive 127:25 received 40:9 98:13 receiving 1:13 recently 1:10	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 regards 16:8 28:21 region 32:1 60:3 124:3 124:18 regret 95:11 regroup 58:4,6	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requested 87:1 requested 87:1 require 26:22 96:11 102:6 105:18 107:12,19 required 17:12 18:15
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24 60:13,17 61:2 65:24 69:6 86:2 91:6,10 106:13 provides 10:14 11:20	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 37:3 40:3 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3 108:11,16,18,23 109:1,3,17 110:5,18 111:4,21 112:13,19 113:16 114:1,22 115:1,4,12,23 116:8 117:11,14 118:3,10 119:15,20 120:22 121:17 122:8,15 123:7,15 124:1,15 125:2,10 126:11 127:7,8 Rae's 5:10 6:21 raise 14:16 48:17	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 receive 127:25 received 40:9 98:13 receiving 1:13 recently 1:10 recitation 42:9	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 region 32:1 60:3 124:3 124:18 regret 95:11 regroup 58:4,6 regular 10:15	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requested 87:1 requests 26:17 85:17 request 26:22 96:11 102:6 105:18 107:12,19 required 17:12 18:15 24:7 25:12 26:16
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 proper 106:25 proper 106:25 proper 106:25 proper 106:25 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24 60:13,17 61:2 65:24 69:6 86:2 91:6,10 106:13 provides 10:14 11:20 12:11 13:25 15:19	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5 Qualitative 116:2 quality 92:22 97:14,16 quantities 69:1 quantity 80:18 82:24 quantum 38:17 question 1:22 4:14,15 4:23 5:14 6:9 7:8,8 8:6,6,6,17,22 9:3,7	$\begin{array}{c} 53:19\ 66:13\ 75:15\\ 77:3\ 119:21\ 126:25\\ 127:5\\ \textbf{quoting}\ 51:22\\ \hline \\ $	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realisite 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 receive 127:25 received 40:9 98:13 receiving 1:13 receit 36:1 40:14 recently 1:10 recitation 42:9 recognises 63:7 70:19	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 regards 16:8 28:21 region 32:1 60:3 124:3 124:18 regret 95:11 regulation 60:15,16	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requested 87:1 requested 87:1 request 26:17 85:17 require 26:22 96:11 102:6 105:18 107:12,19 required 17:12 18:15 24:7 25:12 26:16 32:6 36:14,20 65:4
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 proper 106:25 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24 60:13,17 61:2 65:24 69:6 86:2 91:6,10 106:13 provides 10:14 11:20 12:11 13:25 15:19 16:1 26:16 33:12	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 37:3 40:3 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3 108:11,16,18,23 109:1,3,17 110:5,18 111:4,21 112:13,19 113:16 114:1,22 115:1,4,12,23 116:8 117:11,14 118:3,10 119:15,20 120:22 121:17 122:8,15 123:7,15 124:1,15 125:2,10 126:11 127:7,8 Rae's 5:10 6:21 raise 14:16 48:17	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 receive 127:25 received 40:9 98:13 receiving 1:13 recent 36:1 40:14 recently 1:10 rectation 42:9 recognises 63:7 70:19 recognisen 61:7	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refused 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 regards 16:8 28:21 region 32:1 60:3 124:3 124:18 reguet 95:11 regung 58:4,6 regulation 60:15,16 regulatory 24:21 31:3	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requeste 87:1 requests 26:17 85:17 require 26:22 96:11 102:6 105:18 107:12,19 required 17:12 18:15 24:7 25:12 26:16 32:6 36:14,20 65:4 73:8 85:14 87:4
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 proper 106:25 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:13,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24 60:13,17 61:2 65:24 69:6 86:2 91:6,10 106:13 provides 10:14 11:20 12:11 13:25 15:19 16:1 26:16 33:12 70:20 71:9 73:4	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5 Qualitative 116:2 quality 92:22 97:14,16 quantities 69:1 quantity 80:18 82:24 quantum 38:17 question 1:22 4:14,15 4:23 5:14 6:9 7:8,8 8:6,6,6,17,22 9:3,7	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3 108:11,16,18,23 109:1,3,17 110:5,18 111:4,21 112:13,19 113:16 114:1,22 115:1,4,12,23 116:8 117:11,14 118:3,10 119:15,20 120:22 121:17 122:8,15 123:7,15 124:1,15 125:2,10 126:11 127:7,8 Rae's 5:10 6:21 raise 14:16 48:17 raised 21:10 39:23 45:23 46:15 53:22 RAJA 2:4	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 receive 127:25 received 40:9 98:13 receiving 1:13 recent 36:1 40:14 recently 1:10 recitation 42:9 recognises 63:7 70:19 recognisen 17:768:7 recollection 11:17	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refued 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 regards 16:8 28:21 region 32:1 60:3 124:3 124:18 regret 95:11 reguet 58:4,6 regulation 60:15,16 regulatory 24:21 31:3 rejected 92:13 97:12	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requested 87:1 requests 26:17 85:17 require 26:22 96:11 102:6 105:18 107:12,19 required 17:12 18:15 24:7 25:12 26:16 32:6 36:14,20 65:4 73:8 85:14 87:4 88:18,23 96:21
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:1,3,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24 60:13,17 61:2 65:24 69:6 86:2 91:6,10 106:13 provides 10:14 11:20 12:11 13:25 15:19 16:1 26:16 33:12 70:20 71:9 73:4 84:21 91:3 105:24	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-643 40:6 P-643 37:3,5	53:19 66:13 75:15 77:3 119:21 126:25 127:5 quoting 51:22 Rae 2:15 3:8 5:8,13,21 48:4 58:6,15,19 66:25 67:7,10,13 74:21,23 75:8,15 76:12 77:3,13,22 78:4,11,25 79:20 80:7,13 81:5,14 82:11,15,18 83:5,12 83:13 91:13,16 92:3 108:11,16,18,23 109:1,3,17 110:5,18 111:4,21 112:13,19 113:16 114:1,22 115:1,4,12,23 116:8 117:11,14 118:3,10 19:15,20 120:22 121:17 122:8,15 123:7,15 124:1,15 125:2,10 126:11 127:7,8 Rae's 5:10 6:21 raise 14:16 48:17 raised 21:10 39:23 45:23 46:15 53:22 RAJA 2:4	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 receive 127:25 received 40:9 98:13 receiving 1:13 recent 36:1 40:14 recently 1:10 rectation 42:9 recognising 1:7 68:7 recollection 11:17	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 reflections 118:9 reflections 118:9 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regard 16:8 28:21 regions 32:1 60:3 124:3 124:18 regret 95:11 regulation 60:15,16 regulationy 24:21 31:3 rejected 92:13 97:12 relate 34:21 75:4 80:2	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requested 87:1 request 26:17 85:17 require 26:22 96:11 102:6 105:18 107:12,19 required 17:12 18:15 24:7 25:12 26:16 32:6 36:14,20 65:4 73:8 85:14 87:4 88:18,23 96:21 104:6 105:22 107:2
promise 9:16 promote 10:20 proper 106:25 properly 18:9 propose 3:11,21,23 4:2 7:20 8:4,12 13:12,15 proposed 3:15 41:17 74:8 93:4 proposing 31:14 44:23 proposition 30:6 provide 3:24 5:14 9:18 10:18 14:15 15:4,19 18:7,15 20:11 26:3,19 58:21 58:24 59:1,8 62:16 63:8 71:19 89:14 98:6 provided 10:17 13:16 14:7 16:10 17:13,7 17:18,20 18:2,6,11 19:10 30:21 33:14 37:17 39:10,18 40:5 42:7 44:22 51:24 60:13,17 61:2 65:24 69:6 86:2 91:6,10 106:13 provides 10:14 11:20 12:11 13:25 15:19 16:1 26:16 33:12 70:20 71:9 73:4	putting 3:7 P-0350 2:2,3 P-188 40:22 P-202 40:22 P-203 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-209 40:22 P-210 40:22 P-211 40:23 P-213 40:23 P-214 40:23 P-217 40:1 P-25 44:17 P-544 44:6 P-643 40:6 P-643 40:6 P-644 37:3,5	$\begin{array}{c} 53:19\ 66:13\ 75:15\\ 77:3\ 119:21\ 126:25\\ 127:5\\ \textbf{quoting}\ 51:22\\ \hline \\ $	82:11 85:5 readings 38:24 reads 95:13 ready 34:12 58:4,17 realisation 79:22 realistic 96:4 really 28:14 31:21 117:6 120:16 reason 30:4 52:24 80:14 reasonable 28:11 33:16 115:25 reasonably 4:18 19:12 19:15 20:14 96:17 reasoning 6:3 reasons 5:3 17:23 recall 11:19 12:11 13:25 19:21 26:6 28:12,17 30:22 40:23 60:3 71:1 72:23 101:19 recap 87:18 receive 127:25 received 40:9 98:13 receiving 1:13 recent 36:1 40:14 recently 1:10 recitation 42:9 recognises 63:7 70:19 recognisen 1:7 68:7 recollection 11:17	124:10 referring 64:1 76:12 78:15 118:20 120:19 124:15 125:11 126:11 refers 68:17 69:20 70:3 88:12 120:17 126:15 reflect 46:21 111:10 127:16 reflection 103:5 reflections 118:9 reformulated 76:20 refresh 8:15 refued 40:25 regard 17:14 18:19 23:13 25:23 27:22 41:15 56:19 regarding 1:22 10:11 13:22 16:3 27:11 41:10 44:22 regardless 32:3 86:14 89:9 106:2 regards 16:8 28:21 region 32:1 60:3 124:3 124:18 regret 95:11 reguet 58:4,6 regulation 60:15,16 regulatory 24:21 31:3 rejected 92:13 97:12	remember 125:22 remit 11:2 reopening 57:15 reorganise 59:7 115:10 repeat 4:3 77:10 repeating 90:21 repetitive 94:4 reply 41:2 report 24:18 30:25 32:12 reportedly 35:2 reports 28:19 representation 66:14 REPRESENTED 2:17 representing 30:10 Republic 1:16,18 2:2 2:17 3:2 2:21 request 16:2 27:2 53:23 127:19,24 requested 87:1 requests 26:17 85:17 require 26:22 96:11 102:6 105:18 107:12,19 required 17:12 18:15 24:7 25:12 26:16 32:6 36:14,20 65:4 73:8 85:14 87:4 88:18,23 96:21

Trevor McGowan

Page 10

requirement 14:14	65:21 67:5 78:2	schedule 5:23 52:15	119:7	sharing 21:6 22:1	site 9:6,19 15:2,5,13
18:7 33:11 71:19	80:6 104:22 111:18	88:7 90:11 94:6	seised 46:5 57:13	sharing 21.0 22.1 sheet 87:16	15:15 17:13 18:16
91:11 98:16 99:7	114:1 127:13,14	100:15	select 25:12,25 94:10	shelf 41:13	19:18,23 20:11,16
requirements 12:19	right-hand 95:13	scheduling 70:9 93:24	94:23	short 58:12 126:20	24:15 25:4,9,12,14
24:21 31:3 35:13	riparians 45:17	106:16 107:22	selected 108:6	shorter 68:12 101:1	25:18,24,25 26:4,13
99:5	RIPPIN 2:14	scheme 2:22 3:1,9 4:4	selecting 94:8,19	126:15	26:25 28:5,7 30:7
requires 12:7 19:4,10	river 14:2,9 17:4	7:13,20 47:24 54:25	97:20	shortly 38:15	30:10,16,24 31:20
26:13 72:3 83:6	23:21 29:2 30:17	127:11	selection 9:19 15:5	short-circuited 85:12	32:2 36:19,20 40:7
87:3 90:2 92:9	35:24 37:13,20 38:1	schemes 107:25 108:2	25:10,24 26:4,25	show 73:18 74:15	60:5 74:6,7 76:8,10
94:10 97:13 98:13	38:4,6,12,18 39:12	SCHOFIELD 2:20	selections 26:14	90:18 95:17 101:6	76:23 77:11,14,20
99:25 102:19 107:1	55:4 60:3,4,8,18	scientific 83:1	selects 9:5 15:2 25:4	101:20 110:24	79:18 86:11 87:24
121:9	86:5,15 89:10,13	scope 27:23,23 52:11	self-evidently 32:21	showed 110:16 124:16	91:8
requiring 108:7	91:8 108:24 112:1	screen 36:22,23 37:6	semi-accurate 121:12	128:8	sites 10:24 11:1,5
	120:1	37:11 65:18 78:2,24		showing 17:13 100:8	
requisite 21:2		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	send 49:23	0	18:21 28:25 29:1,20
res 6:1 53:5,8	rivers 10:6,7,25 11:5	83:16 97:16 122:2	Senior 2:22	100:17 118:22	41:17 85:19
rescheduling 92:5	11:25 18:21 19:8	screened 94:10	sense 1:11 3:10 56:4	shown 39:5,8 65:20,24	sitting 104:22
reserve 49:21	41:11,18 42:17,18	screening 97:17	76:12 81:9 118:12	66:3,12 84:11 89:16	situation 111:19
reservoir 120:12,13	43:5,7,18,19,21,22	screening-out 98:4	120:20,22	89:24 95:18 100:3	122:12,16
120:23,25 121:10	43:24 44:12 45:6,11	scripted 6:22	sensible 28:11	125:10	situations 23:13
122:25	45:13 56:14	SEÂN 1:10	sensitive 88:21 92:18	shows 39:19 60:4,8	six 9:20 14:1,8 15:5
reset 96:1	roads 22:21	season 61:17 62:5	98:4 103:2 106:4,5	66:5 70:17 86:10	17:3,19 18:2 21:11
reside 34:3	role 13:7 58:24 127:20	66:17 94:20 123:3	sensitivity 93:18	95:7,12,14 103:15	26:5,7,14 27:18
residual 54:15	rooted 55:6.6	seasonal 123:1	sent 1:10	103:20	54:4 59:11 78:22
resolve 46:25 57:1	round 1:4 4:1,3 7:6	seasonally 119:23	sentence 11:19 15:25	shut 126:18	117:25
	-	v			
resolved 56:8	25:8	seasons 65:2 119:25	sentences 7:9	side 37:14 38:19 51:16	skewed 97:8
resources 2:5 2:8 7:17	round-off 125:2	124:17	separate 6:16 40:13	74:15 95:13 104:14	skipping 10:12
33:2 126:2	rubric 8:9	SEBASTIAN 2:21	105:18	104:22 116:2	slice 104:20,21
respect 10:16,22	rule 29:8	second 1:3,4 5:2 12:25	September 39:4 40:1	significance 77:11	slide 19:25 44:19
23:22 47:11 50:22	ruled 29:19	14:11 15:25 16:13	50:16	124:6,23	58:19 59:18,22 60:1
51:24 53:14 64:14	rules 52:15 112:2	18:5 20:5 24:16	sequence 7:13 47:24	significant 43:17	62:16 63:4,25 64:17
71:22 83:13 119:19	114:15 121:10	30:24 35:12 44:16	94:16,16 107:12	56:25 68:10 71:18	64:21 65:15,16,24
121:15 125:8	run 6:25 48:5 96:16	67:5 70:2 72:10	123:4 127:22	95:5 98:10,21,23	67:13 68:13 69:14
respective 47:13	run-of-river 19:8,17	74:17 76:18 81:16	sequences 94:9,14	significantly 24:3	71:22 73:3 74:16
respects 51:11	20:16 22:17 43:17	93:25 98:11,16	sequencing 107:13	similar 68:18 86:23	76:3 83:20 84:12
respite 128:10	43:19 44:12 45:12	99:10	series 94:22 96:24	121:14	85:16 86:10,10 87:1
responded 4:16 40:2	54:22 60:14 65:12	secondary 59:5 60:7	seriously 56:17	similarly 15:25	
		e e			87:18 89:5,17 92:8
44:10	71:16,16 111:22	61:16,22,24,25 62:1	serve 10:15	simple 45:2 64:6 89:16	94:3 95:6 96:19
responding 53:25	125:12	62:3 63:2,5,8,12,15	served 106:3	118:6 121:6	98:11 99:4,16,19
59:13		63:17,24 64:1,5,9	serves 44:5 62:4	simplification 98:24	100:14 101:3,11,20
response 4:12 25:1	S	64:19 65:3,6,11,13	set 10:10 38:8 56:19	simplifications 107:7	103:10 106:19
34:24,24 40:9 58:21	safely 52:21	65:17 66:6,10,11,15	66:1 74:9 94:21	simplified 92:24	108:17,18 125:11
59:7,9 62:17 87:3	sake 41:20	66:23 67:3,4,6,8,17	105:13	100:18 101:21	slides 42:7,7 44:18
91:1,17 116:20	Salal 36:2	67:20 68:8 69:8,11	setting 1:24	102:4	slip 7:24
responses 3:5 41:21	same 8:9 23:12 43:19	88:11 93:9	settle 118:24	simplifying 121:8	slope 100:7
59:2,10,25	69:21 76:25 79:22	seconds 117:23	settled 118:24	simplistic 66:14	small 62:10 106:7
rest 90:18 101:18		second-round 3:1	settlement 52:1	simply 4:2 15:18 16:7	smaller 30:11
restrictions 41:14	81:10 82:24 95:4	2:20,23	settles 28:8	25:24 29:19 33:11	some 1:9 2:10 4:4,6,12
44:11 86:20	96:2 98:14 102:10	Secretary 2:4,8,9,20	settling 21:24	40:20 41:13 43:8	4:16,18 6:6 7:2,6,7
result 74:11 83:9	103:4 104:14	2:8 7:16	0	45:5,22 46:19 48:25	7:18,22 8:9 10:1
	106:14 109:21		seven 91:2,11,19		
88:20 93:5 96:19	110:8 113:14,18	section 125:11,24	94:15 95:4 99:18	52:8 63:25 73:12	33:16 39:9 42:5,11
101:21 102:23	120:9	sediment 5:19 44:22	119:5	76:24 89:8 90:20	48:17,21 49:14,15
103:8 106:5,14	satisfied 22:8	116:12	seven-day 87:2,6 91:1	96:8 103:15 107:9	49:23 51:11 53:3
107:14 123:4		see 1:9,14 2:23 5:23	91:20 92:4,9 94:8	107:16 113:13	54:6,15 59:9 60:21
	satisfy 22:2				
resulted 97:9	satisfy 22:2 Saturday 3:14 100:24	7:21 10:9 27:10	94:14,25 95:2 98:14	126:1	66:7 68:18 71:4,14
				126:1 since 27:8 29:6 38:14	
resulted 97:9	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10	7:21 10:9 27:10	94:14,25 95:2 98:14		66:7 68:18 71:4,14
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18	since 27:8 29:6 38:14	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4 return 80:1	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9 saying 32:13 55:9	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15 100:24 101:7	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2 105:16 120:25	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17 2:5,15,17,22 27:8	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1 109:14,24 110:16
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4 return 80:1 review 9:19 13:13,21	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9 saying 32:13 55:9 57:19 75:15,19 79:1	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15 100:24 101:7 114:14 116:18	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2 105:16 120:25 Shah 2:5 14:5 36:2	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17 2:5,15,17,22 27:8 27:19 28:3,10 30:19	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1 109:14,24 110:16 111:11 114:23
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4 return 80:1 review 9:19 13:13,21 14:16 15:5 26:4,13	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9 saying 32:13 55:9 57:19 75:15,19 79:1 91:18 122:1 125:7	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15 100:24 101:7 114:14 116:18 119:11 122:2 128:2	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2 105:16 120:25 Shah 2:5 14:5 36:2 Shah's 21:5 22:23	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17 2:5,15,17,22 27:8 27:19 28:3,10 30:19 32:8,17 33:25 34:6	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1 109:14,24 110:16 111:11 114:23 116:19,20 122:20
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4 return 80:1 review 9:19 13:13,21 14:16 15:5 26:4,13 69:14 87:15 97:14	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9 saying 32:13 55:9 57:19 75:15,19 79:1	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15 100:24 101:7 114:14 116:18 119:11 122:2 128:2 seeks 21:21	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2 105:16 120:25 Shah 2:5 14:5 36:2 Shah's 21:5 22:23 34:22	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17 2:5,15,17,22 27:8 27:19 28:3,10 30:19 32:8,17 33:25 34:6 34:13 42:20,22 43:1	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1 109:14,24 110:16 111:11 114:23 116:19,20 122:20 123:20 126:19
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4 return 80:1 review 9:19 13:13,21 14:16 15:5 26:4,13 69:14 87:15 97:14 108:5	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9 saying 32:13 55:9 57:19 75:15,19 79:1 91:18 122:1 125:7	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15 100:24 101:7 114:14 116:18 119:11 122:2 128:2 seeks 21:21 seem 76:3 109:25	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2 105:16 120:25 Shah 2:5 14:5 36:2 Shah's 21:5 22:23 34:22 shalt 15:15	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17 2:5,15,17,22 27:8 27:19 28:3,10 30:19 32:8,17 33:25 34:6 34:13 42:20,22 43:1 43:2 48:8,11,15,21	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1 109:14,24 110:16 111:11 114:23 116:19,20 122:20 123:20 126:19 128:9
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4 return 80:1 review 9:19 13:13,21 14:16 15:5 26:4,13 69:14 87:15 97:14 108:5 revisited 20:23	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9 saying 32:13 55:9 57:19 75:15,19 79:1 91:18 122:1 125:7 says 19:14 23:12	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15 100:24 101:7 114:14 116:18 119:11 122:2 128:2 seeks 21:21 seem 76:3 109:25 seemed 27:20 29:16	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2 105:16 120:25 Shah 2:5 14:5 36:2 Shah's 21:5 22:23 34:22 shalt 15:15 shape 4:13 54:12	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17 2:5,15,17,22 27:8 27:19 28:3,10 30:19 32:8,17 33:25 34:6 34:13 42:20,22 43:1 43:2 48:8,11,15,21 48:24 49:17 50:6	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1 109:14,24 110:16 111:11 114:23 116:19,20 122:20 123:20 126:19 128:9 someone 112:7
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4 return 80:1 review 9:19 13:13,21 14:16 15:5 26:4,13 69:14 87:15 97:14 108:5	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9 57:19 75:15,19 79:1 91:18 122:1 125:7 says 19:14 23:12 29:12,12 33:2,5,14 51:21 52:3 59:19	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15 100:24 101:7 114:14 116:18 119:11 122:2 128:2 seeks 21:21 seem 76:3 109:25	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2 105:16 120:25 Shah 2:5 14:5 36:2 Shah's 21:5 22:23 34:22 shalt 15:15	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17 2:5,15,17,22 27:8 27:19 28:3,10 30:19 32:8,17 33:25 34:6 34:13 42:20,22 43:1 43:2 48:8,11,15,21	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1 109:14,24 110:16 111:11 114:23 116:19,20 122:20 123:20 126:19 128:9
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4 return 80:1 review 9:19 13:13,21 14:16 15:5 26:4,13 69:14 87:15 97:14 108:5 revisited 20:23	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9 57:19 75:15,19 79:1 91:18 122:1 125:7 says 19:14 23:12 29:12,12 33:2,5,14 51:21 52:3 59:19 73:12 78:11 79:23	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15 100:24 101:7 114:14 116:18 119:11 122:2 128:2 seeks 21:21 seem 76:3 109:25 seemed 27:20 29:16	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2 105:16 120:25 Shah 2:5 14:5 36:2 Shah's 21:5 22:23 34:22 shalt 15:15 shape 4:13 54:12	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17 2:5,15,17,22 27:8 27:19 28:3,10 30:19 32:8,17 33:25 34:6 34:13 42:20,22 43:1 43:2 48:8,11,15,21 48:24 49:17 50:6	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1 109:14,24 110:16 111:11 114:23 116:19,20 122:20 123:20 126:19 128:9 someone 112:7
resulted 97:9 results 81:16 92:17 93:19 97:4,9 98:5 107:14 108:1 retained 118:14 rethink 56:4 return 80:1 review 9:19 13:13,21 14:16 15:5 26:4,13 69:14 87:15 97:14 108:5 revisited 20:23 revisiting 46:14	Saturday 3:14 100:24 101:1,10 Saturday/Sunday 115:7 save 49:10 saw 30:9 57:19 75:15,19 79:1 91:18 122:1 125:7 says 19:14 23:12 29:12,12 33:2,5,14 51:21 52:3 59:19	7:21 10:9 27:10 37:24 38:8 39:10,24 48:9 53:7 58:8,14 60:23 64:24 68:4 69:19 82:12 84:12 86:24 87:16 95:6,15 100:24 101:7 114:14 116:18 119:11 122:2 128:2 seeks 21:21 seem 76:3 109:25 seemed 27:20 29:16 seems 34:1 51:3 53:1	94:14,25 95:2 98:14 99:8 102:12,13,18 106:20 107:3,9 114:19 several 58:21 59:5 73:19 92:11 98:2 105:16 120:25 Shah 2:5 14:5 36:2 Shah's 21:5 22:23 34:22 shalt 15:15 shape 4:13 54:12 106:6 123:22,24	since 27:8 29:6 38:14 38:22 91:25 single 76:17 sink 31:15 Sir 2:10 3:3 1:14,17 2:5,15,17,22 27:8 27:19 28:3,10 30:19 32:8,17 33:25 34:6 34:13 42:20,22 43:1 43:2 48:8,11,15,21 48:24 49:17 50:6 51:12 53:18 55:24	66:7 68:18 71:4,14 73:4 77:17 78:8,14 80:2 83:1 87:3,10 91:20 92:5,10 93:14 94:11 100:1 101:15 102:16 107:1 109:14,24 110:16 111:11 114:23 116:19,20 122:20 123:20 126:19 128:9 someone 112:7 something 37:7 61:2

127:25	starting 5:25 87:16	submitted 116:19	50:16 55:17,20	49:17 58:8,10,19	77:1,5,6 78:13,13
sometime 123:3	111:8	subsequent 56:5 59:9	56:10 57:4 59:20	76:2 77:8,21 82:4	81:3,18 86:8 93:23
sometimes 83:2	starts 48:6 70:2	63:15	78:22 80:24 100:2	83:11,12 108:11,16	95:12,21,25 96:16
somewhat 1:8 59:8	117:14	substance 54:6	104:15 105:4 110:1	109:9 111:2,4	97:11 99:18 101:16
102:15	stated 25:17,24 44:7	substantially 107:4	110:15 111:8,15	115:22 123:7 125:1	101:17 102:16
somewhere 33:19	60:10 84:6 92:7	substantive 4:7 5:24	112:8,10 116:22	127:3,8 128:5,12,13	104:5 105:15 110:5
sorry 114:8 125:18	107:2 111:6	13:8 46:9 57:12	117:23 119:18	thanks 128:7	116:17,22 117:17
sort 53:18 54:12,18	statement 3:1 2:20	sub-variants 93:22,23	123:19 127:10	their 5:21 6:3 12:14	119:25 120:25
109:18 116:2	13:18,19 22:23	suffice 43:25	taken 6:14 73:1,9 85:3	19:24 45:18 59:24	throughout 65:1
soundness 24:20 31:2	53:23 55:7	sufficient 58:3 86:2	87:13 100:18 107:7	63:11 64:10 71:14	67:16
sources 7:14 47:25	states 69:6	89:14 108:3	116:1	75:18 85:3 93:17	throwing 117:14
sparse 105:17	station 60:5,13 61:9	sufficiently 60:25	takes 68:13	110:19,24,24	Thursday 95:16
speak 49:18 58:15	61:10,24 64:3 70:16	93:16 108:1	taking 9:25 19:13	116:10 117:20	tied 50:23 51:5 113:23
89:1 116:5	70:18 77:17 84:8	suggest 11:15	39:19 55:20 81:12	124:6	time 2:11,24 5:10 7:23
speaking 125:5	95:18 105:14 120:5	suggested 56:20 86:18	81:25 121:24	themselves 22:3	8:1 32:5,15 34:14
speaks 37:10	125:16	SULJUK 2:7	talk 116:3,3	theory 113:15 114:18	34:16 48:8 55:21,22
special 6:2 84:3,21,23	stations 38:1,11,13,24	sum 63:11 64:4 69:10	talked 126:3	114:18,18,21 115:3	56:10 58:2,4 62:4
123:10	39:13 68:24 124:22	summarise 14:19	talking 110:18 113:6	thermal 69:25 70:1	65:3 66:7,9,18
specific 13:11 16:23	stay 52:20	87:10 106:19	124:21	thing 23:12 35:18	67:14,18 70:5,14
17:9 22:19 50:4	stayed 51:16	summary 71:6 97:20	TANWEER 2:8	73:14 116:13 123:2	71:2 72:21 73:2
59:21,25 62:17 64:7	steam 69:22	summation 64:6	TANZI 2:12	things 60:21 80:2	80:21 81:6,19,25
71:19 72:24 73:25	step 94:24	Sunday 101:1,10	Taobut 40:4	117:14 119:21	82:20,22,23,25 90:6
75:5,19 76:15 79:3 122:11	STEPHEN 2:12 steps 52:19 90:3	113:14 sunk 23:1	TARAR 2:7 TARIO 2:13	120:13	90:11 93:1 94:11,15 100:23 101:1
122:11 specifically 8:18 14:21	steps 52:19 90:3 still 46:23 67:25 96:18	sunk 23:1 superposition 107:18	TARIQ 2:13 task 52:7,10	think 4:19 7:5,9 11:10 23:25 28:12,21,23	100:23 101:1 102:13,21 103:16
18:25 19:4 38:16	101:9 112:19,21,22	supplanted 118:16	TBD 56:7	29:22 30:19 31:4	
76:13 85:8 105:23	112:23 116:25	supplement 119:25	team 111:13	32:17 33:4,17 34:6	103:18,20 104:14 106:9 109:11
specificity 18:2	126:6	supplemental 52:15	Tear 56:22	35:10 42:20 46:16	111:12 116:16
specified 14:4 16:21	stockpiles 22:22	supplementary 93:18	technical 2:14,15	48:17 49:12,13	118:13,20 126:15
17:6,18 52:18,19	store 56:19	supplemented 13:10	58:24 59:11 62:22	51:14 52:20 54:17	127:5
70:16 113:11	stopping 45:10 63:23	supplied 39:12	92:18	54:20 55:14,24	timeframe 81:10
specifies 113:22	storage 36:7 41:11	supply 12:2 15:22	tells 73:10,14 79:3	56:25 58:2,5,5	timely 16:20
specify 15:8,9 16:9	45:12 54:24 69:1	16:3 19:5 33:6	113:1	74:16 78:15 80:2	times 74:12,13,13,13
spectrum 111:22	71:18 96:1 101:18	support 108:4	ten 41:1 48:6 81:9	82:15 85:20 91:22	81:25 82:23,25
112:14,17	104:23 119:13,23	supported 21:17	tended 116:22	91:24 98:16 108:17	109:7
speculative 46:17	120:1,4,24 121:3	22:12 88:25 98:8	tends 123:4	109:22 113:4,15	time-consuming 98:5
speed 72:20 82:24	122:13,15,18,21,25	107:9	tenor 29:22	114:1,16 117:25	timing 1:11 3:4,7 7:24
spent 126:2	123:4 125:8 126:12	supporting 98:6	ten-day 65:19,21 66:2	118:19 120:18	15:16 16:8,25 27:17
spillway 116:12	126:21 127:1	supports 41:18	66:12 67:23 68:3	122:15 124:1,11	47:2,5 56:5 64:19
spillways 6:13 36:7	store 90:15	suppose 28:10 30:4	term 53:1 68:24 69:10	127:13,15,23,24	68:10 70:22 91:21
44:24	stored 108:21 110:1	50:6	69:12,15 83:17,22	128:6,8	95:21 102:22
spirit 11:13 21:24	126:13	sure 40:24 82:5 111:5	83:23,24 117:18	thinking 31:18	123:16 127:16,22
28:15	straightforward	112:4,18 114:17	118:7	third 14:11 16:15	today 1:12 2:9 4:11
split 5:11 110:23	57:18 108:8	115:2 125:3,16,20	terminology 62:24	18:17 20:6 24:18	7:24 47:19 49:5,15
splitting 110:18	stray 52:22	125:22	64:14 68:17,18 72:4	30:25 50:15 64:17	49:20,23 58:20
spreadsheet 65:18	stream 60:15 70:4	surface-water 37:23	118:23	67:5 94:1	59:13 84:11 92:25
98:1	125:13	surmise 52:8	terms 3:4 11:2 15:10	thou 15:15	116:7 126:5 127:9
spreadsheets 94:22	stressed 34:17	suspect 96:24 97:6	16:25 17:1,2 23:21	though 63:22 85:20	together 7:7 8:7 9:25
96:17	stretch 30:17	103:9	27:15 44:8 54:6,8	100:5 110:18	26:10 39:19 74:14
squared 74:17	strike 115:25	sword 36:9	57:11 59:24 60:14	112:13 118:15	110:20 118:13
stack 105:6,9	strikes 28:4	Syed 2:5 7:15	62:13,20,22 64:4,12	thought 6:8 27:9 30:9	tomorrow 1:12 2:6,12
stacking 104:1 111:16	structure 18:5	synonyms 75:13	65:9 68:9,20 71:6	32:4,9 67:2 80:15	3:2 4:10 5:12,16,25
stacks 105:11	studies 20:12,13 62:6	system 61:18 62:2,11	73:19,21 74:14 75:2	91:14	7:2,12,23,25 34:4,9
stage 8:18 14:21 18:25	study 20:5,6 24:19	65:10 70:12,15,17	75:11,22,25 78:14	thoughts 49:16	47:19 48:16,20 49:2
20:7,25 22:14 23:3	31:1	70:17,20 71:21 72:8	80:20 81:1 87:8	thousands 97:25	49:5,16 59:1 73:9
29:24,25 32:23 46:9 stages 20:0 21 20:16	subject 18:17 43:14	72:8,9 74:18 106:7	92:13 99:24 109:19	threads 7:7 26:10	93:11 107:11
stages 20:9,21 29:16 62:21	44:1 46:13 115:7,9 subjective 97:18 98:5	112:21,23 124:2,3	127:17 torribly 66:3	three 7:9 9:25 16:19	117:13 127:10,21 128:1,10
stakeholders 21:1	subjective 97:18 98:5 subjectivity 103:7	125:17 126:14 systemic 56:11	terribly 66:3 territory 45:18	17:22 30:22 64:12 90:3 93:21 115:14	128:1,10 tone 10:10
stakeholders 21:1 stance 21:12	submission 12:18	systemic 56:11 systems 71:4	test 102:7	90:3 93:21 115:14 three-page 37:8	top 36:24 37:1 67:17
stance 21:12 stand 128:4	23:22	systems /1:4	testimony 21:5 34:22	threshold 86:17	104:11 124:20
stand 128:4 standard 43:13 44:8	submissions 3:6 1:5	T	text 27:21 29:11 69:17	through 3:9,23 5:10	topic 6:6 91:25
44:13	1:16,19 2:16,23		69:19 70:23 71:14	8:24 14:20 20:1	topography 31:12
standpoint 119:20	3:20 4:5 5:15 6:5,22	tab 37:9	71:18 106:11	25:18 34:25 37:11	74:6 77:15
stand-alone 62:10	7:19 13:20 29:22	table 39:5,7	125:12,14	38:9 39:11 41:11,23	total 70:11 82:22
start 3:22 9:25 59:18	30:5 42:5,11,24,25	tailored 41:14	texts 68:19 75:16	45:18 60:9 70:10	89:11,19 109:5
75:25 87:18 124:5	47:19 50:13 53:23	take 3:9 8:7 20:3	thank 1:17 2:4,17 27:8	72:12 73:6 74:16,19	124:7
started 118:14	57:16 58:18	27:16 32:24 37:11	34:10,13 36:23	76:6,6,11,21,22	tour 26:12,17,22
~~~~ II0.1 f	27.13 20.10	44:13 48:3,11 49:9	2	,, .,	

40:25	understand 59:22	72:17 106:18	100:17,17 101:21	watersheds 45:20	57:2,4 71:2 80:3
tours 10:22 11:4 18:19	62:24 77:25 115:2	112:19,22 118:25	108:11 109:10,11	watt 72:7,10 74:12,15	92:12 93:18 97:5
towards 45:11	125:3	127:25	111:7 116:15 119:1	74:17	101:6 102:5,9
transcript 1:23 1:19	understanding 41:19	usefully 8:8 46:7	120:8 127:3,8 128:5	watts 72:7 79:1	115:13,23 116:20
1:25 2:2 3:24,25	78:6,18 111:5	uses 36:18 99:17	128:12	way 18:12 34:16 35:2	127:18 128:7
8:12,13,23 9:8,22	understand[s 41:16	using 41:13 64:12	VI 10:4,8,10 13:6	46:25 48:7,7 50:11	Western 19:8 22:17
9:24 14:20 21:14	understood 75:1	67:23 86:15 90:22	37:17	51:12 52:17 53:19	35:24 41:11,18
34:22 41:21 42:9	undertake 13:12	94:6 95:2 99:3	viability 62:13 125:25	54:2 78:6 80:21	42:17,18 43:5,7,19
69:14 72:23	24:23 36:8 38:5	100:12 103:22	view 19:4 20:18 34:2	97:2 103:4 110:14	43:21,24 44:12 45:6
transcripts 41:23	undertaken 32:20	107:21 126:22	41:12 91:4	113:18 115:10	45:13 56:14
transferring 72:6	35:20	usual 84:17	views 22:5 50:18	116:24 117:20,21	wet 61:17 62:5 66:19
transformers 73:24	undertaking 35:24	usually 19:25	<b>VII</b> 10:12 11:7,15 12:8	120:21 121:13	we'll 33:23 34:9 55:2
travelled 72:20 82:25	38:10	utilisation 10:7	12:19 13:1,7 20:19	ways 116:20	59:24 127:14,21
treat 76:9	under-utilised 126:2	utilise 114:24	21:17 24:9,24 31:5	weakening 83:9	we're 29:1 34:15
Treaty's 10:11	unduly 2:10 7:25	utilised 127:2	<b>VIII</b> 10:12,13 13:6	weaponisation 4:15	75:24 79:1,3 80:15
Trevor 1:23	unexplained 107:17		40:8	5:20 41:4,8 48:18	80:23 81:1 82:18
tributary 38:4	unfortunately 42:21	V	<b>VIII(4)(d)</b> 26:12,18,23	49:7	83:10 91:18 94:4
triggered 28:7	uniform 100:9 101:19	valid 97:12	VII(2) 8:19 11:20	weaponization 41:10	95:10 103:1 113:10
trip 112:4	101:23	value 53:7 61:18	12:17 14:22 15:7,12	Webb 2:11 6:12,17	114:4 118:1 121:7
trust 66:3	uniformity 100:12	76:17 81:8,16 84:14	15:14,17,25 16:8	25:17 43:11 44:18	121:20,25 124:2,4
try 3:5 16:22 60:21	<b>unify</b> 110:20	84:15 97:24	17:10 18:1,3 19:1	Webb's 42:4,23	124:21 126:23
109:19	<b>unique</b> 79:23	values 64:5 88:22,23	19:17,19 21:19 26:9	website 50:9	127:19
trying 28:10 52:24	<b>unit</b> 72:8,11,12,12	96:4,24 97:5,7,11	26:11,17 27:16 28:6 28:14 29:12 32:6	Wednesday 113:15	we've 4:3,16 6:14 7:5
98:12 110:20 112:4 117:4,20	<b>units</b> 69:7 72:8,9 73:24 74:18	102:9,25	28:14 29:12 32:6 33:5	week 1:3 6:6 8:13 12:11 33:13 44:4	11:8 30:20 31:9,10 31:19 33:14 34:16
Tuesday 101:7 113:15	<b>unless</b> 101:15 117:10	variability 60:2 68:3	VILMANTE 2:22	46:16 50:20 60:2,10	74:9 105:15 106:14
turbine 77:5,7	unlikely 49:20 97:12	95:14 102:7 106:24	visit 19:23 40:7	71:5,13 88:18,19,25	114:2 127:4
turbines 73:24 76:6	unpack 47:10	117:3 127:1	<b>volume</b> 12:15 70:9	91:12 95:7,13,25	whichever 49:11
76:22 77:1	unpacking 51:4	variable 73:23 80:4,8	72:16,19 79:5,7	96:10 98:8 99:23	109:3
turn 4:6 5:9 8:4 36:11	unreal 55:8	126:10 variables 78:24	81:18 82:1 87:22,24	101:2,14,18 109:5	while 50:25 66:23
36:23 41:3 48:8	unsupported 92:13	variant 106:23	88:4 89:12,19 90:7	110:2 111:13,18	76:7 123:14
50:1 108:12	Unsurprisingly 17:21	variants 106:20	90:13 92:6 98:13,17	112:12,20 120:19	whole 94:13 96:24
Twenty 2:10,11	until 38:22 49:10,13	variation 60:8 80:11	99:13,14,22 100:8	124:2 126:16	102:23
twice 115:15	105:11 128:15	95:12 98:19,20	105:10 109:5,5	weekdays 100:5 101:3	widely 5:17
two 3:10 8:10 26:10	unusual 122:11	109:25 123:1	114:13 115:19,19	109:21,25 110:19	wider 5:2 13:12
26:19 35:5 37:25	upper 45:17 61:7	124:11	119:2,16 120:11	weekday/weekend	WILLIAMS 2:21
38:10 42:12 43:25	104:18 108:20	variations 81:13 88:19	121:25 122:18	112:15	willing 29:21
45:1 49:18 51:20	<b>upriver</b> 30:11	110:16 111:9	126:17	weekend 1:6,18 100:5	windows 42:21
61:23 64:5 71:6	upstream 31:10,14	varies 66:18 100:23	volumes 95:2 100:16	101:12,17 109:15	wish 47:8 49:22,23
74:23 75:11 100:2,6	37:14 77:18	various 6:1 24:19		111:12 112:9,11	117:13
116:1 117:9	urged 40:6	29:19 31:1 40:11,21	W	128:9	wishes 35:22
typical 42:5 95:7,9	Uruguay 23:17,21	62:21 78:14 80:20	WAHEED 2:7	weekends 100:5	wishing 45:8
111:25 124:16	usage 72:5 112:9,11	87:4,11,13 89:7	walked 117:17	109:21,25 110:19	withdraw 120:3
typically 109:18	use 2:24 37:20 59:24	92:9	want 45:17 49:24	111:16	withdrawal 12:13
	60:6 62:22,23 64:15	vary 99:14 105:7	52:22 56:15 59:23	weekly 71:13 91:5,11	witness 22:23
U	65:11 68:20,23	124:23	79:14 80:1 82:19	94:6 97:21 99:2,18	wonder 53:5 119:17
ultimately 71:17	69:10,15 70:23	varying 71:17 102:13	111:4 113:3 114:17	100:15 101:23	wondering 82:13
92:13 97:24 108:2	73:15 75:18 82:1	Vaughn 1:23	115:2,6,6,10,15,15	106:16 109:3,4,24	118:9 126:6
unacceptable 98:3	84:3,7 86:17 88:10	verify 40:18	116:23 127:18	110:16 111:9 112:9	word 11:22 27:24
unbearable 55:8	89:24 94:2 104:8	version 72:9 100:18	wanted 79:5 112:13	113:2 weeks 82:21 95:8 96:6	wording 69:20 122:11 words 12:22 21:8,23
uncertainty 93:19	105:2 107:8 110:11 111:16,21 112:12	102:4	WAPDA 37:22 38:23	96:7,8	<b>words</b> 12:22 21:8,23 21:23 80:20 82:12
97:18	1112:14 113:2,7	versions 92:24	warrant 46:14 57:15	<b>week's</b> 30:5	work 1:8 11:24 12:3,5
uncontroversial 20:4	112.14 115.2,7 114:14 115:6,20	versus 72:20 100:5	warranted 17:9	Welcome 58:14	12:6,21 15:22,24
under 8:19 14:22 19:1	114:14 115:0,20	109:21	wasn't 53:11 54:18	well 6:15 27:23 28:23	16:2,4,18 20:16
20:19 21:19,20 23:7	121:7 122:8 123:13	vertical 103:18	117:6 119:11 126:1	29:23 30:7,10 33:2	28:14 29:14 33:6,9
23:23 24:9,24 25:9	123:15,21,24,25	vertically 65:22	water 2:5 1:23 2:8	33:14,22 42:4 46:18	52:15 53:1 56:6
25:11,16,21 26:9,16	125:18,20	Verulam 2:11,12	7:17 33:2 37:22	74:4 75:8 78:18	68:21 72:12 95:11
26:18,22 32:6 36:4	used 30:11 62:4,12	very 1:12 2:4 11:7,10	39:21 45:18 73:21	81:8 82:18 87:13	111:11 117:20
37:17 40:8 43:23 45:18 52:1,4 55:5	63:6 65:6 67:20	17:11 24:10 29:23	89:19 90:15 101:18	96:12 102:14 113:5	125:8 128:8,11
,	68:17,18,25 72:4	33:18,19 34:9 38:14 40:24 41:5 45:19,22	111:24 119:2,17,23 122:19,23 126:13	116:23 117:15	working 28:23 93:13
75:5 78:21 85:23 97:15 103:21	75:3,12,15 83:18	40:24 41:5 45:19,22 47:3 48:24 49:9,19	122:19,23 126:13	118:10 119:20	94:22
104:24 105:3	92:23 98:24 102:9	47:3 48:24 49:9,19 51:3,15 54:5,5,7	waters 1:2 2:5 10:7	122:20 123:22	works 10:24 11:1,5
104.24 105.5	103:25 110:3	56:9,17,17 57:24,24	11:24 12:7,9,12,13	124:1	14:2,9 16:11 17:4
122:25 123:1	112:21 113:2	58:8 62:19,22 66:13	12:16 16:13 19:6	well-reasoned 55:21	18:21 19:5 22:7,8
underground 31:16	120:13 125:8	67:11 75:25 88:21	37:20 38:5 41:14	went 109:12 116:17	22:20 32:23 81:3
underlying 6:3 116:25	useful 24:16 31:17	92:18,23 95:23	44:20 45:9,19	were 2:7 17:15 28:23	91:5 105:1
underneath 104:12	33:20 34:1 45:24	96:24 98:4,16	watershed 21:4 98:19	37:4 46:12 53:24	World 56:16 125:23
	1			1	1

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$						
writing 1-33         writing 1-33         Writing 1-32         Writing 1-32<	WOUTER 1.12	17 37.9 /0.1 86.10	102.7	62344.7		
virtue     virtue <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
13:18 49:04 56:6       77       63 4172         17:21 18:18       18 40:64 12:42:1       25:59:18 99:4       63 427         7:63 112:25       193 43:22;       20:05:25 91:8 99:4       7         7:63 112:25       193 43:22;       20:05:25 91:8 99:16       7         7:7       193 43:22;       20:05:10:16       7         994 13:22;       199 36:3       3       7       74:24 (2:40:5)         994 13:22;       99:10:12;       7       74:17:42:3       7       73:10         994 13:10:21       199 82:2;       3:11:11:24 (2:86:1);       7       76:23       77       76:23         994 13:10:21       199 82:4;       3:11:124 (2:86:1);       7       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23       77       76:23 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
71:2118:18     8:40:64:12:44:21     26:12:59:18:90:4     73:9       76:4113:25     19:91:43:31:42:7     26:10:62:18     77       X     87:18     27:34:85:16:99:16     77       X     87:18     27:34:85:16:99:16     77       Y     19:91:43:31:42:7     27:34:85:16:99:16     71:21:24:12:40:3:50:13       Y     Y     19:91:43:31:42:7     27:34:85:16:99:16     71:72:73:71:12:40:3:50:13       Y     Y     19:93:63     32:11:12:41:28:61:7     71:73:73:71:13:71:71:73:75:11       99:30:64:14:11:60:9     2     2:11:12:12:86:17     79:92:24       99:10:12:12:25:72     2:11:12:12:25:72     30:10:12:18     30:10:12:18       90:10:21:12:25:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:						
x         S71         260         02.18         7           764.113.25         19         91.4         353.42.2,7         26.6         06.218         7         8.24         91.4         35.113.64.21         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7	13:18 49:24 56:6	<b>177</b> 9:13	<b>255</b> 9:2,23	<b>63</b> 42:7		
764 113:25 $19$ 941 4353 42.27 $260$ 6635 $x$ $8718$ $8718$ $2734$ 851 69916 $7$ 824 4912 403 3013 $y$ $1964$ 1453 42.27 $294121021$ $70$ 73 4722 $70$ 73 4722 $y$ $1993$ 62 $321112$ 412 66.1 $7174$ 723 $717423$ $y$ $1993$ 62 $321112$ 412 66.1 $7174$ 723 $717423$ $y$ $1993$ 62 $321112$ 412 66.1 $77$ $717423$ $717423$ $y$ $1938$ 62 $321112$ 412 66.1 $3775811$ $3910020000$ $775841$ $y$ $23130219$ $901018.16$ $90925$ $910018.16$ $9771433$ $9910012.16$ $932238773$ $910012.16$ $93232397748$ $91002.166.15$ $9922581632$ $992258100000124221$ $92225878.79812$ $93236228787.1781.1621$ $93223877.181.1621$ $93223877.181.1621$ $93223877.181.1621$ $9323287.188.142$ $9222.167.118$ $x$ $110241104.157.12$ $219442.2453.122$ $3237.381.1620$ $932.1622.2107.18$ $81422$ $993.106.22107.18$ $81422$ $993.106.22107.18$ $81422$ $993.106.22107.18$ $81422$ $993.106.22107.18$	71:2 118:18	<b>18</b> 40:6 41:24 42:1	<b>26</b> 1:25 59:18 99:4	<b>67</b> 3:9		
764 113:25 $19$ 941 4353 42.27 $260$ 6635 $x$ $8718$ $8718$ $2734$ 851 69916 $7$ 824 4912 403 3013 $y$ $1964$ 1453 42.27 $294121021$ $70$ 73 4722 $70$ 73 4722 $y$ $1993$ 62 $321112$ 412 66.1 $7174$ 723 $717423$ $y$ $1993$ 62 $321112$ 412 66.1 $7174$ 723 $717423$ $y$ $1993$ 62 $321112$ 412 66.1 $77$ $717423$ $717423$ $y$ $1938$ 62 $321112$ 412 66.1 $3775811$ $3910020000$ $775841$ $y$ $23130219$ $901018.16$ $90925$ $910018.16$ $9771433$ $9910012.16$ $932238773$ $910012.16$ $93232397748$ $91002.166.15$ $9922581632$ $992258100000124221$ $92225878.79812$ $93236228787.1781.1621$ $93223877.181.1621$ $93223877.181.1621$ $93223877.181.1621$ $9323287.188.142$ $9222.167.118$ $x$ $110241104.157.12$ $219442.2453.122$ $3237.381.1620$ $932.1622.2107.18$ $81422$ $993.106.22107.18$ $81422$ $993.106.22107.18$ $81422$ $993.106.22107.18$ $81422$ $993.106.22107.18$	wrong 27:24 54:20.21	87:1	<b>26(a)</b> 62:18			
N91:43:33:42:27 87:18262:60:18 78:48:16:92:1678:249:12:40:3:90:13 51:13:62:17:07:07:70:73:47:22 70:07:34:72:27 70:07:44:16:09: 65:16:13:18:101 94:13:102:1991:43:23:42:77 197:82:3278:249:12:40:3:90:13 51:13:13:12:14:12:86:17 79:22:24 $V$ 198:28:22 94:13:102:19197:83:3 12:24:16:12:19:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:22:86:17 199:11:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 11:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 11:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 11:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 11:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 109:14:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 109:14:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 109:14:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 109:14:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 109:14:13:12:11:12:18:12:12 109:14:13:12:11:12:18:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:				7		
x         s7:18         27:34 85:16 99:16         73:13 16:21           y         1948 1:22         23:45:16 99:16         71:13 6:21         70;13 74:72           y         1960 1:2         29:44:17 10:11         71:74:23         71:74:23           y=m 01:2 0:24:64:20         1988 22:2         3:21:11:21:41:28 6:17         71:74:23         73:10           y=st:11:10:12         199:2.24         3:21:11:21:41:28 6:17         91:11:13:13:11:40         73:75:11         74:31:0           y=st:11:10:12:11:19:12         3:37:75:11         91:10:13:10:19         3:37:75:11         88:13         87:89:10:00:14:17:22           y=10:11:13:10:19         20:11:13:10:19         3:37:75:11         3:37:73:10:01:19         93:10:02:10:01:14:19         93:10:02:10:01:14:19           y=10:11:13:10:19         20:04:87:15:81:16         3:37:73:83:16         3:37:73:83:16         3:10:72:22           y=10:12:10:10:10:10:10:19         20:13:10:16         3:37:16:32         3:10:17:39:10:13:23         3:10:12:23           y=10:12:10:10:10:10:19         20:13:10:10         3:10:12:14:12         3:11:10:12:14:12         3:10:12:14:12           y=10:12:10:10:10:10:19         20:13:10:10         3:11:10:10:11         3:11:10:10:11         3:11:10:10:11         3:11:10:10:11         3:11:10:10:10:11         3:11:10:10:10:11 <td>70.4 115.25</td> <td></td> <td>. ,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	70.4 115.25		. ,			
X       Tests       198       122       28       21       70       74       70       74       70       74       70       74       70       74       70       74       70       74       70       74       70       74       70       74       70       74       73       74       70       74       75       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       74       76       73       73       76       73       74       76       73       74       76       73       74       76       74       76       73       73       74       76       73       74       76       73       74       76       73       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74       74		-				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	X			51:13 64:21		
V1952 1:23 1978 3:6329 4:417 10:11 37.17 4:23 7.17 4:23 7.10 17 4:23 7.17 4:20 4:23 4:24	X 76:18	<b>1948</b> 1:22	<b>28</b> 2:1 100:14	<b>7(a)</b> 7:3 47:22		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		<b>1952</b> 1:23	<b>29</b> 44:17 101:11			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	V	<b>1960</b> 1:2				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			3			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	year 61:2 62:4 64:20					
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	65:1 66:13,18,19					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	67:17 68:8.11.12		9:11,13 13:21 14:19	<b>79</b> 22:24		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		<b>1992</b> 29:6	18:24 60:1			
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \hline 027 6520 8520 8512 \\ \hline 0237 6520 8512 \\ \hline 0337 112 \\ \hline 0241104, 15, 17 \\ \hline 10524 1104, 15, 17 \\ \hline 1162 1261 126 \\ \hline 10524 1104, 15, 17 \\ \hline 1162 1261 126 \\ \hline 10524 1104 126 \\ \hline 1162 1104 126 \\ \hline 1162 1104 126 \\ \hline 1162 126 \\ \hline 1162 126 \\ \hline 1163 1104 \\ \hline 1165 126 \\ \hline 1163 112 \\ \hline 1163 11 \\ \hline 1165 12 \\ \hline 1161 126 11 \\ 1052 12 \\ \hline 1161 126 11 \\ \hline 1052 14 \\ \hline 10512 \\ \hline 1052 12 \\ \hline 1052 126 \\ \hline 10512 \\ \hline 1052 12 \\ \hline 10512 \\ \hline 1052 12 \\ \hline 1052 1$			<b>3.37</b> 58:11	8		
$\begin{array}{c} 237, 6320, 85, 18 \\ 122, 17, 122, 5 \\ 122, 17, 122, 5 \\ 122, 111, 122, 5 \\ 122, 111, 122, 5 \\ 122, 111, 122, 5 \\ 122, 111, 122, 5 \\ 122, 111, 122, 112, 114, 114, 119, 12 \\ 121, 1122, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 120, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1124 \\ 121, 1224 \\ 121, 124 \\ 121, 124 \\ 121$		2				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	•	2 3.1 3 1.21 25 8.25				
yellow (66.8):1212:20 131 (2019) 30:17 24:10.24 36:13 59:18 109:13 30:10.21 8100:14 30:000 124:21 30:25 24:50 447 98:12 30:25 24:50 447 98:12 30:25 22 30:10:25 22 30:11:25 20:11:25 30:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 30:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 30:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25 20:11:25					1	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	122:17 126:2,5	-		93:7 114:3	1	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	yellow 66:6,8,12,24			<b>8(b)</b> 63:3,14,18,21	1	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	•	21:17 24:10,24	<b>300</b> 102:18		1	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	<i></i>	-			1	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			,	-		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					1	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	zero 97:2 111:24				1	
ZOHA R2 :7 zones 66:24       200 (487 358 81:16 817 8559 90:54)       38:14 2:12 47:10 54:3 80% 86:25 87 41:25 87 41:25 87 41:25 88 41:25	126.19			8(d) 25:22		
		<b>2(i)</b> 64:8 73:5 81:16	<b>35(a)</b> 4:23 46:1,12		1	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		83:17 85:9 90:5	47:10 54:3			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	<b>zones</b> 66:24					
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			000 9 111			
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	1			88 41:25		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1 8.24 9.9 18.14 21.14					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			<b>4</b> 9:1,1,9,10,11,12,12	9		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		<b>20</b> 8:25 41:25 44:19	9:14 40:8 42:1.1.2.2	<b>9</b> 2.1 7.8 9.10 13.24		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		89:5 126:13				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	41:25,25 58:19	<b>20(a)</b> 91:18				
194 (124:5)      105 (11) 52:12 (12) 52:12 (12) 53:15 (14) 54:12 (14) 55:13 (14) 54:12 (14) 54:12 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14) 54:15 (14)	72:10,10	• •	. ,			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	1% 124:5		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	38:22 39:2,16 47:23		
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$			<b>4(b)</b> 4:12	67:13		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			<b>4(d)</b> 8:6 9:17 14:19	<b>9.30</b> 128.15		
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		<b>201</b> 42:16 43:4 56:13	25:1 26:2			
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		<b>2010</b> 23:16		90th 44.4		
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	<b>100%</b> 36:21 86:25	2018 35:3 38:14.22				
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	100,000 124:4,19					
11       8:25       50:16       51:21       202 $39:17$ 42       42:21         125:11       202 $39:3$ 42       42:7       44       41:24         113:9:10       2023 $39:3,3$ 40:1,1,4,6       45       61:7         113:9:10       2023 $39:4,17$ 60:6       450       64       41:24         129:1       2023 $39:4,17$ $60:6$ 46       41:24         129:1       2024       1:6       1:1       19:23       48       3:5         129:1       21:8:25       9:2.23       41:24       49.872       38:22       39:4         12:24       21:1       21 $8:125$ $9:2.23$ $41:25$ $49.872$ $38:24$ 12:24       21:1       21 $9:12$ $22:71:22$ $7:3:8:13$ $9:4:3$ $5.000$ $42:15$ $49.872$ $36:25$ $59:1.2:1,3,14,22$ $19:25$ $41:25$ $49.872$ $50:12$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:126:5$ $50:$	108 3:11					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			<b>400,000</b> 124:21			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			<b>42</b> 42:7		1	
12:112022 $39:3,3,40:1,1,4,6$ $45.6:17$ 111 th 44:162023 $39:4,17.00:6$ $45.0:17$ 113.9:102024.1:6:1:1.19:23 $45.5:17$ 116 9:102024.1:6:1:1.19:23 $45.5:17$ 12.9:142024.1:6:1:1.19:23 $48.3:5$ 12.24 21:1421.8:25.9:2.23.41:24 $46.41:24$ 12.19:1121.8:25.9:2.23.41:24 $59:1,2,13,14.22.19:25$ 12.24 21:1421.6:1:1.10:0:17 $59:1,2,13,14.22.19:25$ 12.9:1221.7.42:1 $21.7:22.72:3.83:13$ 9:129:13.42:1 $5.16.10:14$ 13.8(18)20.9:13.42:1 $5.46.128:14$ 13.9:822.9:13.42:1 $5.46.128:14$ 9:1422.4.9:1499:25.115:8109:1422.4.9:1429:25.115:811.1122.5.9:1 $500-1,000.124:22$ 9:38.94:19.8:12,13 $9:25.9:2,23.83:20$ 9:46,24.100:13,16 $84:2.95:6$ 102:2,5,8.20.106:2224.1:25.19:23.89:209:61.11.15.85:16105:12109:1424.9.91:6109:14.15.85:1620.12109:14.15.85:1621.12.139:04.65105:12109:1424.9.91:23.89:209:04.6590.65		<b>2021</b> 39:3	<b>44</b> 41:24		1	
11 Int 44:162023 $39:4,17\ 60:6$ 450 $24:4$ 113 $9:10$ 2023 $-01\ 1:3$ 46 $41:24$ 116 $9:10$ 2024 $1:6\ 1:1\ 19:23$ 38:22 $39:4$ 12 $9:1\ 42:1\ 71:22$ 21 $8:25\ 9:2,23\ 41:24$ 48 $3:5$ 12 $9:1\ 42:1\ 71:22$ 21 $8:25\ 9:2,23\ 41:24$ 48 $3:5$ 12 $9:1\ 42:1\ 71:22$ 21 $8:25\ 9:2,23\ 41:24$ 59:12,13,14,22\ 19:2512 $9:1\ 12\ 9:11$ 217 $42:1\ 22\ 72:3\ 83:13$ $94:3\ 516\ 108:14$ 21 $9:12\ 42:1\ 71:22\ 72:3\ 83:13$ $94:3\ 516\ 108:14$ 13 $4:15\ 9:13\ 41:7\ 59:4\ 73:3\ 76:3\ 130\%\ 98:18,18\ 100:1\ 109:14$ 220 $9:13\ 42:1\ 5.46\ 128:14\ 50\ 86:18\ 98:18\ 99:25\ 115:8\ 500-1,000\ 124:22\ 59:1\ 223\ 9:14\ 225\ 9:1\ 223\ 9:14\ 225\ 9:1\ 227\ 9:1\ 23\ 8:25\ 9:2,23\ 83:20\ 84:2\ 95:6\ 227\ 9:1\ 23\ 8:25\ 9:2,23\ 83:20\ 84:2\ 95:6\ 227\ 9:1\ 23\ 8:25\ 9:2,23\ 83:20\ 84:2\ 95:6\ 227\ 9:1\ 23\ 8:25\ 9:2,23\ 83:20\ 84:2\ 95:6\ 24\ 1:25\ 19:23\ 89:20\ 96:19\ 101:8\ 104:5\ 105:12\ 45\ 105:12\ 45\ 118\ 64:17\ 45\ 118\ 64:17\ 45\ 118\ 64:17\ 45\ 118\ 64:17\ 45\ 118\ 118\ 118\ 118\ 118\ 118\ 118\ 11$					1	
113 9:102023-01 1:346 41:24116 9:102024 1:6 1:1 19:23 $46 41:24$ 117 9:11 $38:22 39:4$ $49,872 38:24$ 12 9:14 42:1 71:22 $18:25 9:2,23 41:24$ $68:13 92:8$ 12 -24 21:14 $21(a) 120:17$ $5 9:1,2,13,14,22 19:25$ 123 9:12 $217 42:1$ $217 42:1$ 13 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 $227 71:22 72:3 83:13$ 94:3 $94:3$ 73:3 76:3 $220 9:13 42:1$ 109:14 $224 9:14$ 109:14 $224 9:14$ 119:11 83:20 $225 9:1$ 15 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12 $225 9:1$ 93:8 94:1 98:12,1399:4,6,24 100:13,16102:2,5,8,20 106:22107:18 115:7 127:416 9:11,15 85:16109:14121 9:11,15 85:16105:12113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4113 115:7 127:4 </td <td><b>111th</b> 44:16</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	<b>111th</b> 44:16				1	
116 9:10 $2025 01 1.3$ $46 41:24$ 117 9:11 $2024 1:6 1:1 19:23$ $38:22 39:4$ $48 3:5$ 12 9:1 42:1 71:22 $21 8:25 9:2,23 41:24$ $68:13 92:8$ $5$ 12.2-4 21:14 $21(a) 120:17$ $5 9:1,2,13,14,22 19:25$ 12 9:11 $217 42:1$ $217 42:1$ $5 9:1,2,13,14,22 19:25$ 12 9:12 $217 42:1$ $217 42:1$ $5 9:1,2,13,14,22 19:25$ 13 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 $94:3$ $5.16 108:14$ $73:3 76:3$ $220 9:13 42:1$ $5.46 128:14$ $130\% 98:18,18 100:1$ $221 9:13 42:2,3$ $500 42:15 43:3$ $109:14$ $224 9:14$ $99:25 115:8$ $109:14$ $225 9:1$ $500-1,000 124:22$ $238 94:1 98:12,13$ $9:25 9:15.8$ $99:4,6,24 100:13,16$ $84:2 95:6$ $102:2,5,8,20 106:22$ $24 1:25 19:23 89:20$ $96:19 101:8 104:5$ $66 1:6 4:14 9:9 27:5$ $105:11 585:16$ $105:12$	<b>113</b> 9:10	,			1	
117 9:11 $38.22 39:4$ $48 3:5$ 12 9:14 2:171:22 $38:22 39:4$ $48 3:5$ 13 9:24 21:14 $21.25 9:2,23 41:24$ $68:13 92:8$ 12 -24 21:14 $21(a) 120:17$ $59:1,2,13,14,22 19:25$ 12 9:11 $217 42:1$ $217 42:1$ 13 9:12 $217 42:1$ $94:3$ 13 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 $94:3$ 94:3 $220 9:13 42:1$ 10% 98:18,18 100:1 $223 9:14$ 109:14 $224 9:14$ 109:14 $224 9:14$ 227 9:1 $225 9:1$ 228 9:14 $225 9:1$ 227 9:1 $225 9:1$ 99:46,24 100:13,1699:4,6,24 100:13,1699:4,6,24 100:13,1699:4,6,24 100:13,1699:4,6,24 100:13,1699:1,15 85:16102:2,5,8,20 106:22107:18 115:7 127:496:19 101:8 104:5105:12105:12127 9:12128 9:14129:14129:15 89:26129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16129:1,15 85:16<	<b>116</b> 9:10				1	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					1	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			<b>49,872</b> 38:24		1	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					1	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		68:13 92:8	5		1	1
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		<b>21(a)</b> 120:17			1	1
$\begin{array}{c} 123 \ 9:12 \\ 134:15 \ 9:13 \ 41:7 \ 59:4 \\ 73:3 \ 76:3 \\ 139\% \ 86:13 \\ 130\% \ 98:18,18 \ 100:1 \\ 109:14 \\ 14 \ 9:11 \ 83:20 \\ 15 \ 1:6 \ 1:1 \ 12:10 \ 84:12 \\ 93:8 \ 94:1 \ 98:12,13 \\ 99:4,6,24 \ 100:13,16 \\ 102:2,5,8,20 \ 106:22 \\ 107:18 \ 115:7 \ 127:4 \\ 16 \ 9:11,15 \ 85:16 \\ 102:2,5,8,20 \ 106:22 \\ 107:18 \ 115:7 \ 127:4 \\ 16 \ 9:11,15 \ 85:16 \\ 105:12 \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 41:25 \ 42:2,3 \ 63:25 \\ 5,000 \ 42:15 \ 43:3 \\ 5,16 \ 108:14 \\ 5,46 \ 128:14 \\ 99:25 \ 15:8 \\ 500-1,000 \ 124:22 \\ 58 \ 3:6,8 \\ \hline \hline 6 \ 1:6 \ 4:14 \ 9:9 \ 27:5 \\ 34:18 \ 64:17 \\ \hline 6 \ 1:6 \ 4:17 \\ \hline \end{array}$	<b>121</b> 9:11				1	
13 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 $22772.272.383.13$ $94:3$ 73:3 76:3 $94:3$ $5,000 42:15 43:3$ 13% 86:13 $220 9:13 42:1$ $5.16 108:14$ 109:14 $221 9:13 42:2.3$ $5.060 42:15 43:3$ 109:14 $221 9:13 42:2.3$ $5.060 42:15 43:3$ 109:14 $221 9:13 42:2.3$ $5.06 86:18 98:18$ 92:3 9:14 $225 9:1$ $500^{\circ} 86:18 98:18$ 99:4,6,24 100:13,16 $84:2 95:6$ $500^{\circ} 1000 124:22$ 99:4,6,24 100:13,16 $84:2 95:6$ $84:2 95:6$ 107:18 115:7 127:4       96:19 101:8 104:5 $66$ 105:112 $105:12$ $105:12$ $54:14 9:9 27:5$			41:25 42:2,3 63:25		1	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<b>123</b> 9:12	<b>77</b> 71.00 70.2 02.10	E 000 40 15 40 0		1	1
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			5,000 42:15 43:3		1	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4	94:3	/			
130% 98:18,18 100:1 $223$ 9:14 $223$ 9:14 $109:14$ $224$ 9:14 $224$ 9:14 $14$ 9:11 83:20 $225$ 9:1 $225$ 9:1 $15$ 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12 $227$ 9:1 $50%$ 86:18 98:18 $99:4,6,24$ 100:13,16 $84:2$ 95:6 $500-1,000$ 124:22 $107:18$ 115:7 127:4 $96:19$ 101:8 104:5 $50$ $16$ 9:11,15 85:16 $105:12$ $61:104:17$	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3	94:3 <b>220</b> 9:13 42:1	<b>5.16</b> 108:14			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13	94:3 <b>220</b> 9:13 42:1	<b>5.16</b> 108:14 <b>5.46</b> 128:14			
14 9:11 83:20       225 9:1       99:25 115:8         15 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12       227 9:1       500-1,000 124:22         93:8 94:1 98:12,13       23 8:25 9:2,23 83:20       84:2 95:6         99:4,6,24 100:13,16       84:2 95:6       24 1:25 19:23 89:20         107:18 115:7 127:4       96:19 101:8 104:5       6         16 9:11,15 85:16       105:12       34:18 64:17	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1	94:3 <b>220</b> 9:13 42:1 <b>221</b> 9:13 42:2,3	<b>5.16</b> 108:14 <b>5.46</b> 128:14 <b>50</b> 126:5			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1	94:3 <b>220</b> 9:13 42:1 <b>221</b> 9:13 42:2,3 <b>223</b> 9:14	<b>5.16</b> 108:14 <b>5.46</b> 128:14 <b>50</b> 126:5 <b>50%</b> 86:18 98:18			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 224 9:14	<b>5.16</b> 108:14 <b>5.46</b> 128:14 <b>50</b> 126:5 <b>50%</b> 86:18 98:18			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14 <b>14</b> 9:11 83:20	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 224 9:14 225 9:1	<b>5.16</b> 108:14 <b>5.46</b> 128:14 <b>50</b> 126:5 <b>50%</b> 86:18 98:18 99:25 115:8			
102:2,5,8,20 106:22       24       1:25 19:23 89:20         107:18 115:7 127:4       96:19 101:8 104:5       6         16 9:11,15 85:16       105:12       34:18 64:17	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14 <b>14</b> 9:11 83:20 <b>15</b> 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 224 9:14 225 9:1 227 9:1	<b>5.16</b> 108:14 <b>5.46</b> 128:14 <b>50</b> 126:5 <b>50%</b> 86:18 98:18 99:25 115:8 <b>500-1,000</b> 124:22			
102:2,5,8,20 106:22       24 1:25 19:23 89:20         107:18 115:7 127:4       96:19 101:8 104:5         16 9:11,15 85:16       105:12         100:1:2       02:25	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14 <b>14</b> 9:11 83:20 <b>15</b> 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12 93:8 94:1 98:12,13	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 224 9:14 225 9:1 227 9:1	<b>5.16</b> 108:14 <b>5.46</b> 128:14 <b>50</b> 126:5 <b>50%</b> 86:18 98:18 99:25 115:8 <b>500-1,000</b> 124:22			
107:18 115:7 127:4       96:19 101:8 104:5       6 1:6 4:14 9:9 27:5         16 9:11,15 85:16       105:12       34:18 64:17	<b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14 <b>14</b> 9:11 83:20 <b>15</b> 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12 93:8 94:1 98:12,13 99:4,6,24 100:13,16	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 224 9:14 225 9:1 227 9:1 23 8:25 9:2,23 83:20	<b>5.16</b> 108:14 <b>5.46</b> 128:14 <b>50</b> 126:5 <b>50%</b> 86:18 98:18 99:25 115:8 <b>500-1,000</b> 124:22 <b>58</b> 3:6,8			
<b>16</b> 9:11,15 85:16 105:12 <b>34:18</b> 64:17	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14 <b>14</b> 9:11 83:20 <b>15</b> 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12 93:8 94:1 98:12,13 99:4,6,24 100:13,16 102:2,5,8,20 106:22	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 225 9:1 227 9:1 23 8:25 9:2,23 83:20 84:2 95:6	<b>5.16</b> 108:14 <b>5.46</b> 128:14 <b>50</b> 126:5 <b>50%</b> 86:18 98:18 99:25 115:8 <b>500-1,000</b> 124:22 <b>58</b> 3:6,8			
100.12	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14 <b>14</b> 9:11 83:20 <b>15</b> 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12 93:8 94:1 98:12,13 99:4,6,24 100:13,16 102:2,5,8,20 106:22	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 224 9:14 225 9:1 227 9:1 23 8:25 9:2,23 83:20 84:2 95:6 24 1:25 19:23 89:20	5.16 108:14 5.46 128:14 50 126:5 50% 86:18 98:18 99:25 115:8 500-1,000 124:22 58 3:6,8 6			
<b>24-hour</b> 81:23 99:13	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14 <b>14</b> 9:11 83:20 <b>15</b> 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12 93:8 94:1 98:12,13 99:4,6,24 100:13,16 102:2,5,8,20 106:22 107:18 115:7 127:4	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 224 9:14 225 9:1 227 9:1 23 8:25 9:2,23 83:20 84:2 95:6 24 1:25 19:23 89:20 96:19 101:8 104:5	5.16 108:14 5.46 128:14 50 126:5 50% 86:18 98:18 99:25 115:8 500-1,000 124:22 58 3:6,8 <u>6</u> 6 1:6 4:14 9:9 27:5			
	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14 <b>14</b> 9:11 83:20 <b>15</b> 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12 93:8 94:1 98:12,13 99:4,6,24 100:13,16 102:2,5,8,20 106:22 107:18 115:7 127:4 <b>16</b> 9:11,15 85:16	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 224 9:14 225 9:1 227 9:1 23 8:25 9:2,23 83:20 84:2 95:6 24 1:25 19:23 89:20 96:19 101:8 104:5 105:12	5.16 108:14 5.46 128:14 50 126:5 50% 86:18 98:18 99:25 115:8 500-1,000 124:22 58 3:6,8 <u>6</u> 6 1:6 4:14 9:9 27:5 34:18 64:17			
	<b>13</b> 4:15 9:13 41:7 59:4 73:3 76:3 <b>13%</b> 86:13 <b>130%</b> 98:18,18 100:1 109:14 <b>14</b> 9:11 83:20 <b>15</b> 1:6 1:1 12:10 84:12 93:8 94:1 98:12,13 99:4,6,24 100:13,16 102:2,5,8,20 106:22 107:18 115:7 127:4	94:3 220 9:13 42:1 221 9:13 42:2,3 223 9:14 224 9:14 225 9:1 227 9:1 23 8:25 9:2,23 83:20 84:2 95:6 24 1:25 19:23 89:20 96:19 101:8 104:5 105:12	5.16 108:14 5.46 128:14 50 126:5 50% 86:18 98:18 99:25 115:8 500-1,000 124:22 58 3:6,8 <u>6</u> 6 1:6 4:14 9:9 27:5 34:18 64:17			